THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

JOSEPHUS' PRESENTATION OF FIRST-CENTURY JUDAISM.

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Faculty

Of the Graduate School of Arts and Literature

In Candidacy for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

THE GRADUATE DIVINITY SCHOOL

By

JACOB BOS

Chicago

~~June~~ September.

1922

7299

C O N T E N T S

Preface:			Page 1
Chap. I.		Characteristics of Josephus' Writings	3-15
	1.	Sketch of his Life	3
	2.	Description of his Writings, what they contain, limitations (about Rules. Jews only, mainly political information), general features.	6
	3.	Point of View and Characteristics of his account including historical trustworthiness.	11
Chap. II.		The Political Status and Aim of Judaism	16-37
	1.	Organisation and Administration of the Jewish State	16
	2.	The Roman Imperial Control of Palestine	20
	3.	Various Jewish Attitudes toward the Roman Government	23
	4.	Reasons for the War of 66-73 A. D.	28
	5.	The Results of the War to Judaism	34
Chap. III.		The Social Institutions and Conditions of Judaism	38-68
	1.	Number and Distribution of the Jews in Palestine	38
	2.	Hellenistic Influence upon the Palestinian Jews	41
	3.	The Aristocracy and the Common People	47
	4.	The Social Aspect of the Temple	51
	5.	The Social Aspect of Synagogue	56
	6.	Agriculture the Chief Occupation	57
	7.	Business and Industry	61
	8.	Family Customs and Conditions	64
Chap. IV.		The Intellectual Life and Achievement of Judaism	69-100
	1.	Jewish-Literature of the First-Century A. D.	69
	2.	The Professional Class of Teachers and Scholars	77
	3.	Education in the Synagogue	84

	4. Education on the Home and School	Page	86
	5. Medical Knowledge and Practice		91
	6. The Limitations of Jewish Thought		96
Chap. V.	The Religious Customs and Faith of Judaism		101-140
	1. Worship and Sacrifice at the Temple		101
	2. Worship in the Synagogue		104
	3. Religious Life in the Jewish Home		106
	4. The Sabbath		108
	5. Ceremonial Customs		111
	6. The Faith of Standard Judaism		117
	1. God		117
	2. Man		124
	3. Sin		126
	4. Salvation (including Messianism)		130
	7. Other Types of Jewish Faith		136
	1. Sadducees		136
	2. Essenes		138
	Selected Bibliography		141

PREFACE

The purpose of this study is to give Josephus' presentation of first-century Judaism in its various aspects, political, social, intellectual, and religious. Much has been done upon specific phases of Josephus' works, such as his use of sources, (e.g. Bloch, Holscher and von Destinon), his chronology, (e.g. von Destinon and Niese), and his apologetics, (e.g. Kruger, Bentwich, et al.). There is, besides, an abundant literature upon Judaism of the first-century using Josephus' works with others as sources of information. Hitherto no attempt has been made in a single study to gather the material in his writings that present every phase of the first-century Judaism, limiting this study to Josephus.

The writings of Josephus being mainly political in character, it is impossible in our limited space to give attention to all that is said of the political status of Judaism. In chapter 2, sections 1 and 2, therefore, we have dealt only with the Sanhedrin and the policy of the Roman government in Palestine. For the other chapters one is not embarassed by such abundance of material. For our study we have limited ourselves to those parts of his writings which cover the history of Judaism during the first century. The selected passages will show this.

The texts of Niese, Muller and Naber, especially Niese and Muller, were consulted when the correct interpretation of a passage depended upon the Greek words or grammatical construction. The notation adopted is book, chapter, paragraph, and the Niese section in parenthesis, e.g. Ant. 19.1:9(52). In the quotations the Margoliouth version is used, chiefly because he has inserted the Niese sections, although, as the editor says in his preface, the Shilleto revision of

Whiston is more thorough-going. The Niese section in parenthesis is added to facilitate reference. Other versions consulted are the Shilleto translation of all Josephus' works, and Traill's translation of the War.

We do not claim for any part of the study to have used all the passages that may be used, but rather the representative passages which, we believe, give us the full presentation of first-century Judaism by Josephus. Some things that we should like to know about first-century Judaism, are not recorded by Josephus, and some things that we do know are not mentioned by him. The circumstances of his life, his personal interests and attitude, his environment, particularly after the War, have influenced his writings. His silence upon certain phases of Judaism may also be thus explained.

CHAP. I. THE CHARACTERISTICS OF JOSEPHUS' WRITINGS.

1. Sketch of His Life.

Josephus was born "in the first year of the reign of Caius Caesar," Life 1(5); cf. Ant. 20.11;3(267). He was the son of a priest Matthias, and on his mother's side came from royal ancestry, Life 1 (2, 5). As a lad he received his first education with his brother Matthias, Life 2(8). When fourteen years of age he had become exceptionally proficient in the law, Life 2(9). When sixteen years of age he began a study of the three sects. From his sixteenth to his nineteenth years he professes to have lived with Banus an ascetic. Afterward, when he had acquired a knowledge of the sects, he returned to Jerusalem and began to live as a Pharisee, Life 2(12). When twenty-six years old, he went to Rome to secure the release of certain priests.[1] Upon his voyage to Rome he was shipwrecked, but was rescued with others, eighty in all, by a ship from Cyrene. Upon appealing to Poppea through a friend Aliturus, our author secured the release of his friends the priests, Life 3(16).

He thereupon returned home where he found that hostilities had already begun. Until the repulse and defeat of Cestius' forces Josephus remained in Jerusalem, Life 5(21), and was then chosen to be military governor of Galilee. Between his twenty-seventh and thirtieth years events proceeded rapidly. Although the district of Galilee was in a mutinous condition, Life 12(62), Josephus claims to have immediately begun the judicial and military organization of the people, War 2.20;5f. Seventy elders were chosen to rule all Galilee,

---

1. A. von Gutschmid, Kleine Schriften, Vol. 4, p.338, says concerning the purpose of Josephus' journey to Rome: "Der Hauptgrund war aber wohl, das es condicio sine qua non fur eine politische Carriere war, sich die Weltstadt angesehen zu haben."

as also seven judges for each city. He thereupon mobilized an army upon the Roman plan; and instructed the soldiers in war tactics. The insurrectionary element under John of Gischala and others soon proved too energetic for Josephus. The account of his rule is little more than a rehearsal of meeting the strategy and charges of his personal enemies with counter strategy and charges. His opponents besought the Sannedrin at Jerusalem to recall him, but he evaded the summons. His brief, half-hearted and inefficient rule of Galilee ended in the Roman siege of Jotapata, when he was captured and placed in the custody of Vespasian. For the account of his Galilean administration see Life 9-74(32-413); War 2.20:4(568f); 2.21; 3.4:1(59-63); 3.6:3-3.8(127-408); 3.9:1,5,6.

As a captive, he won the favor of Vespasian and Titus, Life 75(414f). He accompanied Titus to Alexandria. When Titus returned to Palestine to assume command of the Roman army during the final siege of Jerusalem, Josephus accompanied him, Life 75(416). During the Jewish siege he, upon the request of Titus, War 5.9:2(361), urged the people to surrender, War 5.9:3(362f).

At the fall of the city he secured the release of some friends. He was also given "the holy books by Titus' concession." Besides, he saved the life of his brother, and of fifty friends together with one hundred and ninty of his acquaintances, and restored the fortunes of the latter, Life 75(418-19).

Afterward he accompanied Titus to Rome, where he witnessed the triumph of Vespasian and Titus which is described in detail, War 7.5:3(121f). Josephus says he was kindly treated by Vespasian, given an apartment in the royal palace, honored with the privilege of Roman

citizenship, given an annual pension, and a gift of land in Judea which Domitian later freed from taxes. About this time he married again, having divorced the two previous wives. He was the father of five children, The favors of Vespasian were continued by Titus and Domitian, Life 76(428(. Josephus says that when he "got leisure at Rome", Ap. 1.9(50), he wrote the Greek history of the War. His entire life as a royal favorite must have been devoted to literary work.

The date of our author's death is unknown. He closes his autobiography with the words: "And this is the account of the actions of my whole life." The date of his death is dependent upon the date of his autobiography. If the late date after 100 A. D. is accepted for this, Josephus must have lived on into Trajan's reign. If the earlier date, 93 or 94, is accepted he may have lived on beyond 100 A. D., but more probably died late in the last decade of the first century A. D.

2. Description of His Writings.

The genuine writings of Josephus are Antiquities, Life, War, and Apion. All are apologetic, Ant. Pref. 1(4); 20.11:3(266); Life 76(430); War Pref. 1-5(1-16); War 7.11:5; Ap. 1.1(3); 2.41(295); also the general tenor of the writings, and numerous specific apologetic statements found throughout his works. The Antiquities (20 books) contain a history of the Jewish nation from its origin to the twelfth year of Nero, with an introductory supplement of "what Moses says of the creation of the world", Ant. Pref. 4(26); Ant. 20.11:2(259f); and all this was based upon the "sacred books", the Old Testament, of the Jews. The Life, begun and closed by a few autobiographical remarks, Life 1-6(1-27); 75-76(414f), is mainly a personal defense of the author's conduct in the war as governor of Galilee, Life 7-74. The War (7 books) was written in Greek to give the world what the author regarded as the true account of the causes, course of events and results of the War. It was occasioned by previous fictitious accounts of the War. Against Apion (2 books) is a defense of the Jewish religion. Its antiquity, Ap. 2.38(279), and the superiority of the Jewish law to induce piety and good citizenship are the main points of defense. It was called forth by a revival of anti-Semitism after the War, Ap. 1.1(2f). The urgent request of his literary friends, chiefly Epaphroditus, the desire of the Greeks to know the history of the Jewish nation, and the willingness of the Jews' forefathers "to communicate such things to others" were reasons for writing the Antiquities. All were written in Greek to a Greek-speaking public.

The Greek history of the War was written first. There is frequent reference in the Antiquities, Life, and Apion to the War, e.g.

Ant.13.5;9(173); Ant. Pref. 2(6), et al. Josephus regarded the Life as an appendix to the Antiquities, Ant. 20.11;3(266-268). Apion was written later than the Antiquities. Both were dedicated to Epaphroditus, Life 76(430); Ap. 2.41(296). The War was dedicated to the Greeks and Romans, War Pref. 5(16).

Josephus says that he presented the War to Vespasian for his approval, Ap. 1.9(50). Vespasian died in 79 A. D. Allowing a few years after 73 A. D. when Jewish hostilities ceased, for Josephus to prepare his material for the War, Ap. 1.9(50), we may arrive at Margoliouth's[2] date 73-79 A. D. The Antiquities and the Life as its appendix were completed in 93-94 A. D., Ant. 20.11;3. If Apion was dedicated to the Epaphroditus who died about 95 A.D., the work must have been written very shortly after the Antiquities. But the priority in time of Life to Apion remains an open question.[3] The probabilities seem to favor Niese's view that the Life as an appendix to

---

2. Margoliouth, Works of Flavius Josephus, Introd. p.12, sec.4; cf. Niese, Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, Vol. VII p.571, for terminus a quo; and von Gutschmid, Kleine Schriften, Vol. 4 p.344; cf. War 7.5;3(158).

3. Niese's statement, Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, Vol. VII p. 575, "the concluding words of the Vita put it absolutely beyond doubt that the work was composed while Domitian was still alive", is too sweeping. The passage, Life 76(429), may be reminiscent of Domitian's kind treatment, and written after Domitian's reign. It is strange that Josephus does not mention Trajan; but the Life was written strictly as an apology dealing with events in Vespasian's, Titus', and Domitian's time, and there was perhaps no apologetic occasion in Trajan's time to warrant mention of events in his reign. The words "And this is the account of the actions of my whole life," Life 76 (430), may mean that this was all that needed mention for his apologetic purposes. Other evidence such as Ant. 20.11;3(266), the "σε ", continuance, beginning Life, Epaphroditus, cf. Niese, art. Jos. Hastings Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, Vol. VII p.570f., to whom Antiquities and Life were dedicated, and who is supposed to have died in 95 A. D., support Niese in his view that the Life was finished in 93 or 94 A. D. against Schurer, Geschichte des Judischen Volkes, Vol. I p.88, who holds that it was written some time after 100 A. D. but Life 76(429-30), vague as it is, does not warrant Niese's statement setting aside the evidence for Schurer's view. See also Laquer, Flavius Josephus, p.1f.

Antiquities was with it finished in 93-94 A.D. Then Apion immediately followed.

Writings mistakenly ascribed to Josephus are IV Maccabees[4], and a fragment on Hades. These for our purposes need not be discussed. In Ant. 3.5:6(94); 3.8:10(223); 4.8:4(198), Josephus promised to speak about the laws of Moses more explicitly. In Ant. Pref. 4(25); 1.1:1 (29); 1.10:5(192); 3.6:6(143); 20.11:3(268) he promised to write about Jewish philosophy and religion. These promises may have been fulfilled to some extent in Apion; yet, in Ant. 20.11:3(268) he mentions three books, whereas the Apion contains two books.

Josephus wrote almost exclusively about Palestinian Judaism. Except for an occasional chapter, Ant. 13.3; 14.10; 16.2,6; 17.2; 18. 9; 20.2-4; War 7.7:10; and incidental allusions dealing with Judaism in the dispersion, and some passages referring intirely to Roman affairs, e.g. Ant.19.1-3, all of Antiquities after the close of the Biblical account and the War deals with Palestinian Judaism. Such things as his depreciation and silent neglect of the Temple at Leontopolis, War 7.10:3(431); Ant. 20.10:1(237), his single reference to Philo as a philosopher and entire silence respecting his writings, Ant. 18.8:1, his praise of centralized worship in Jerusalem, Ant. 4. 8:5(203), the fact that for him the downfall of the city virtually brought the end of the Jews' national existence, Ant. 18.1:1(6f); War 2.16:4(397), show that he was principally interested in Palestinian Judaism. His exaltation of the aristocracy of rulers in Jerusalem points in the same direction.

Except the Apion and the first three books of the Antiquities, the writings of Josephus are mainly devoted to the political history

---

4. See R. H. Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, Vol. II p. 656f for a discussion of the authorship of IV Macc.

of the nation. The Jewish people of Palestine were located on the great highway of the nations, and were constantly threatened and overrun by larger surrounding nations. Thus, for one of Josephus' experience in the war and as a friend of the Roman generals who quelled the great revolt, the political history of the nation must have been the main interest. Then too, much of the high idealism of the nation was rather nourished in the obscure silent places than in the city Jerusalem, the home of Josephus. His apologetics seeking to improve the present standing of the Jews among the nations, the fact that he was of royal lineage, and that as a young man he moved among the rulers in Jerusalem led him to emphasize the political side of his people's history. Even his enumeration of the high-priests, Ant. 20.10, is a political account. He closes the Antiquities by saying: "I have also carried down the succession of our kings, and related their actions, and political administration, etc. for this it was that I promised to do in the beginning of this history", Ant. 20.11:2(261). He speaks in Apion of a theocracy which in the light of his account of the nation's history amounts only to a nation ruled by an aristocracy of priests. He is not so confident about his qualifications for describing the religion of his people as he is for writing the War, Ap. 2.14(145b); 1.10(54-55). In the War we find Josephus representing Judaism as involved in the synoretism of the first century chiefly from a political standpoint. The reason lies in the fact that although he was a firm adherent of Jewish religion, yet he was not deeply religious. In this he was Sadducean rather than Pharisaic; and his chief interest was in world affairs, and notin piety and righteousness. He gives a religious, or rather theological, reason for the war, but it does not strongly suggest

the essential difference between Jewish idealism with a heritage of centuries of prophetism and wisdom teaching lying back of it, and Hellenism with all that it implies for the Jewish people.

Josephus claims to prefer historical accuracy to literary style for his writings. He says the Jews cared little for "smoothness of periods", Ant. 20.11:2(264). In closing the War he says: "Of which history how good the style is must be left to the determination of the readers; but as for the agreement with the facts, I shall not scruple to say, and that boldly, that truth hath been what I have alone aimed at through its entire composition," War 7.11:5(455); Ap. 1.10; Ant. Pref. 1; War Pref. 1f; Ap. 1.5(27). What he refers to in such statements is the conscious and sometimes labored effort at rhetorical polish of some Greek writers.

There is some conscious effort at good style in Josephus. His speeches are Thucydidean, that is, written by the author himself, but as though spoken by characters in particular events, and given a content which for the author suited the particular occasions, War 6.1:5(33-53); 7.8:6-7(323-388); 1.19:4(373f); 4.3:10(163f). Figures of speech are sparingly used. His works being chiefly historical narrative do not demand them. He knew how to allegorize. The principal illustration of it perhaps is the chapter describing the temple in detail, War 5.5; Ant. Pref. 4(24). One can trace differences of style, due no doubt, to the author's use of sources. He must have sought to retain the interest of his readers by interspersing his narrative with sensational court scandal, or a bit of common superstition, e.g. Ant. 16.7:3(194f); 17.5:7(131); War 7.6:3(178f). The sprinkling of episodes through the historical narrative cannot altogether be explained on the ground of scarcity of historical materi-

als. Josephus, with Herodotus, knew his readers enjoyed a story. It was their naïve way of retaining interest. Except in passages where the author seems to be quoting e.g. Ant. 14.10, the Roman decrees, he freely alters his sources to fit them into his account. General coherence and unity of narrative is evident. He is careful not to lose the thread of his main purpose, War 5.1;3(20); 3.5;8 (109), but still there is a happy interspersing of geographical and other details which only serve to make the narrative interesting. His works also show considerable vigor, and in places, elegance. His works also contain descriptive passages, e.g. War 3.3; 5.4-5, that are informing; but his geographical references are not always correct, War 3.3;5(53); 2.10;2(188); 3.9;1(409).

3. Point of View and Characteristics of His Account.

Josephus' political position is that under Rome the Jewish nation when obedient enjoyed prosperity. Rome was fated to become the mistress of the world; and those who opposed the imperial government fought against God. Rome than became His agent to punish the revolters, and with them the people, for their sins. It is useless to struggle against the Romans since they are lords of the habitable earth. For the Jews there is hope neither of victory nor of escape in revolting against Rome, War 2.16:4.

Josephus' social viewpoint is that of a priest and a member of the aristocracy. In the purpose of God this aristocracy was chosen to rule the people, Ant. 4.8:2(186); 4.8:17. He is keenly conscious of his ancestry and position among the leaders, Life 1, et al. He claims for his class the support of the people during the war, but with this claim goes a sense of superiority over the people. As an apologist Josephus meets the charge of exclusivism. His countercharge is that other peoples were restrictive of their rights, Ap. 2.36(257f). He produced the Roman decrees, Ant. 14.10; 16.6, to show that the nation enjoyed the friendship and alliance of the Romans, Ant. 14.10: 26(267), and to reconcile others to the Jews, Ant. 16.6:8. According to Josephus it was an ancient custom to receive sacrifices and donations from foreigners, War 2.17:3-4(417). Jerusalem was a city famed among the nations, War 7.1:1(4). Strangers worshipped at the Temple, War 6.9:3(426); and it had a court for the Gentiles. The privileges of Judaism were free to those who accepted them, Ap. 2.28(210); 2.36(261).

There is a measure of truth in some of the apologetics on this point. The countercharge above is fact; yet, a countercharge does not in itself set aside the opponent's charge. The people too, no doubt,

disapproved receiving sacrifices and donations from non-Jews. It may be said, them, that the Jews were not uniquely but rather more exclusive than other nations. Josephus as an apologist sought to commend his nation to others. Personally he was certainly much less exclusive than the people in general.

His religious interest centers about the Temple and its worship. For Josephus perhaps the great sin that brought the city to destruction was ceremonial pollution of the Temple, War 5.13;6(566); 6.2;1 (99f); see also chapter 2, sec. 4 of this study under "religious cause of the War." One is led to think that he made little distinction between ceremonial and moral transgression. His statement that Titus desired to spare the Temple itself, War 6.4;7(266), not only indicates his defection to Rome, but also his love for the Temple. His lamentation over the fallen city, War 6.10, comes from one for whom the soul of religion is best expressed in observance of the ceremonial law and traditions of the fathers. We fail to trace in his writings any hope held out to his nation after 70 A.D. His motives, methods, and attitude toward the Romans were not those of the Zealots whom he much misunderstood, but it must be granted that the preservation of his nation centralizing its life in the holy city and Temple worship was his primary motive at least, early in the War. Our study of his writings does not lead us to regard him as a traitor to his country during any period of his life; and there is no portraiture of Josephus[5] equal to that of his own writings.

Our author's Hellenistic leaning leads him freely to alter the Old Testament.[5] In doing so he belies his own words, Ap. 1.8(42). His

5. A. von Gutschmid (Kleine Schriften, Vol. 4,p.350), says concerning the Antiquities: "fur uns ist der geschichtliche Werth da, wo die Bücher mit der Bibel parallel gehen, gleich Null".

additions to the Old Testament account do not necessarily always imply other available sources. For reasons such as a desire to adjust the Old Testament to his Greek readers, he was led to use it freely as he used his other sources.[6] He is sometimes guilty of gross exaggeration, the most notable one in numbers being that of the number of besieged Jerusalem during the final siege, War 6.9:3(424); Ant. 17.10:4(269). His statements concerning the Zealots and their kind and his high praise of the Romans are exaggerated, cf. War 6.4; 4.9:10. Historical fact is sometimes sacrificed to his own attitude. He has inconsistencies in his chronology,[7] and elsewhere,[8] cf. War 1.11:1(218) with Ant. 14.11:1(270); cf. 18.6:10(224) with War 2.9:5(180); cf. Ant. Pref. 2(6) with War Pref.6(17). He shared the superstitions of his day, War 4.8:3; cf. 4.8:4(484f); 1.17:3(328). However, his Hellenistic predilections led him in other passages to assume an embarassed attitude toward the Old Testament account, Ant. 1.3:9(108); 2.16:5(348). Other unique features of Judaism's religion were also changed or neglected to the extent that he in a large measure disqualified himself as a writer upon Israel's religion in all its aspects. He could even yield a point in ceremonial law, Life 23(113). His open protest

---

6. Niese, Historische Zeitschrift, Vol. 76, p.207, says: "Leicht fliessen ihm die Myriaden aus der Feder"; cf. War 2.18:3(468); 3.3:2(43); 2.20:2(561).

7. B. Niese, Hermes, Vol. 28, p.194: "Josephus hat in seinen historischen Schriften die Zeitrechnung weder vernachlassigt noch mit besonderem Fleisse behandelt. Ab gesehen von vielen Fluchtigkeiten, die der nicht sehr gewissenhafte Schriftsteller begangen hat, beherbergt er manche Widerspruche, ohne dass er sie bemerkt zu haben scheint." See also Ant. 11.8 Where Sanballat (Neh. 6) is a contemporary of Alexander the Great. See also Biblical World, Vol. 31,0.451, article "Jewish Temple at Elephantine."

8. Schürer, Real-Encyklopädie, u.s.w. Vol. VII,p.111: "Eine grobliche Entstellung ist die Darstellung seiner galiläischen Wirksamkeit in seiner Vita. Die Unwarheiten Derselben lassen sich auf Grund seiner eigenen Darstellung in Bellum Judaicum in den Hauptpunkten noch deutlich nachweisen."

additions to the Old Testament account do not necessarily always imply other available sources. For reasons such as a desire to adjust the Old Testament to his Greek readers, he was led to use it freely as he used his other sources. He is sometimes guilty of gross exaggeration

against idolatry was shared with cultured Greek and Roman writers; and the protest was hardly a dangerous venture. His " ", the Deity, Ant. 18.7:2(256); 18.8:7(297); 16.2:3(42); et al., is an accomodation to Greek thought. His language sometimes seems to be purposely obscure. In describing the religion of Judaism he is ignorant of or purposely silent upon features objectionable to his readers. Sometimes, he removes the objectionable By a turn of words, e.g. "Caius made himself a god." With his people, however, Caius made himself God, not a god.

With all Josephus' defects, the historical trustworthiness of his War need not be doubted. He is true to his conscious and initial purpose, War Pref. 4(90. Although tendency and personal attitude are everywhere evident, yet from his narrative we are able to form an historical opinion regarding the events of the war. Elsewhere we trace a hesitancy to state facts, but he nevertheless does state them. His claim to almost absolute accuracy of details must be judged by the standards of his time. But he shows a certain impartiality in narrating events which amply justified in his day his claim to qualifications for writing history, War Pref. 4. His Apion, both in setting forth the charges of his enemies and his answer to those charges, is a characteristic first century apology for the Jews. It has weaknesses of argument, inconsistencies, useless counter charges, and refusal to admit defects. But it shares with its day what for us seems sometimes to be only superficial discussion of essential incompatibilit of opposing systems of religious thought. It is withal a splendid

9. A. von Gutschmid, Kleine Schriften, Vol.IV, p.351, says: "die Geschichte des Herodes ist bei Josephos ein compromiss zwischen der schmeichelhaften Ueberlieferung durch Nikolaos und der entgegen gesetzten Volkstradition"; cf. Ant. 16.11:81

apology for a religion with a rich heritage of high idealism and pious practice by one who never intended for a moment to abandon it, and who thought enough of it to put forth his best effort in its defense.

CHAP. II. THE POLITICAL STATUS AND AIM OF JUDAISM.

1. Organization and Administration of the Jewish State.

Roman control of the Jews began definitely with Pompey in 63 B. C., and from the first the imperial government assumed the right to select the high-priest who should rule the people. In the struggle between Aristobulus and Hyrcanus for the high-priesthood, Pompey decided for Hyrcanus, Ant. 14.4:4(73); 20.10:1(244). The reasons for Pompey's decision are characteristic of the deposition and selection of later high-priests. Julius Caesar later only confirmed the choice of Pompey, Ant. 14.8:5(143); War 1.9:6(194). The selection of high-priests after Hyrcanus is summarized by Josephus in Ant. 20.10:1(247f). Although selected and deposed at the will of the Roman government, yet they were ever regarded as the rulers of their nation.

The aristocracy, under the high-priest as its head, was the Sanhedrin. No mention is made of any change in this body by Pompey. But Gabinius, 57 B.C., is said to have divided the nation into five parts, and over each part to have placed a ruling council. These were located at Jerusalem, Gadara, Amathus, Jericho, and Sepphoris in Galilee, Ant. 14.5:4(91); War 1.8:5(170). We hear nothing more about this partitioning of the Jewish nation, only that the people were pleased to be freed from monarchy and to be governed in the future by an aristocracy, War 1.8:5(170).

Shortly afterward we read that Herod, son of Antipater, when governor of Galilee, was summoned before the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem to stand trial for putting a certain Hezekias to death without the consent of the Sanhedrin. One concludes that the scheme of Gabinius in appointing five councils had failed, for one of his councils was in Sepphoris where it seems Herod as governor of Galilee might have been tried.

Earlier we read that Moses had appointed seven judges for every city. If these could not decide in any case, the case should be sent to the "holy city" where "the high-priest, the prophet, and the Sanhedrin"might render a decision, Ant. 4.8:14(218). In Ant. 9 there is record of Jehoshaphat purposing a similar constitution, Ant. 9.1:1. During the war Josephus wrote to the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem for information and direction regarding certain matters, Life 12(62). As a result of complaints against him to the council in Jerusalem, the council sent an embassy to Galilee to arrest Josephus and send him to Jerusalem, Life 39-40(195f).

On the other hand we read that Josephus formed a council upon assuming his duties as military governor of Galilee, Life 14(79). There is mention of the senate of Tiberias, Life 12(64), to ten of whose number the furniture of Herod the tetrarch's palace in Tiberias was entrusted, Life 13(69). In Tiberias Josephus "assembles his friends as a Sanhedrin." We read that he appointed seventy elders as rulers of all Galilee and seven judges in each city "to hear the lesser quarrels"; possible death sentences were to be given only by him with the seventy elders, War 2.20:5(570f). He is here clearly following the Mosaic order, Ant. 4.8:14(214).

Josephus' evidence is that there were subordinate judicial bodies in the provinces, and that in his time the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem was regarded as a higher court than the councils in the other cities of Palestine. The scheme of Gabinius implies that the Jerusalem council was only one of the five, and not superior to the others.

There is no direct reference to a change in the plan of Gabinius. It is probable, however, that the change was made by Julius Caesar. The change had evidently been made at the time Herod the tetrarch was sum-

moned before the court in Jerusalem, 47 or 46 B.C. In the high-priesthood Hyrcanus was confirmed by Caesar, and Antipater was made procurator of Judea, Ant. 14.8:5(143). In doing this Caesar is said to have "settled the affairs in Syria", including Judea, Ant. 14.9:1(156). It is highly probable that with the firm support of Caesar and the assistance of Hyrcanus, the shrewd Antipater increased the powers of the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem making it superior to those in other cities; and that in a short time under his management of affairs in Judea, Gabinius' arrangement fell through and was forgotten.

The fact that Herod could be summoned to face the Sanhedrin shows its large power. The speech of Sameas upon this occasion also suggests it. He says that the accused are wont to appear in submission and fear, and that by speech, personal bearing and attire they usually seek to move the stern judges to compassion, Ant. 14.9:4(172). The Sanhedrin only had the power to pronounce death sentence, Ant. 14.9:3(167). They would have given such sentence to Herod, had it not been for Hyrcanus' intervention in his behalf, against which the judges protested, Ant. 14.9:4(177f). It is not certain that Mariamne was tried by the Sanhedrin. The statement is that Herod "got together those that were most faithful to him", Ant. 15.7:4(229).

The Sanhedrin could be assembled only by the ruling Roman official. We are told that Ananus upon assuming the office of high-priest, 61 or 62 A. D., desiring to exercise his authorityin the absence of Albinus, the procurator, assembled the council to try James the brother of Jesus who was called Christ, and some others. We are citing the passage not to deal with the testimony of Josephus to Jesus, but simply to illustrate the relation of the Sanhedrin to the civil government. For this rash act Ananus was deposed after ruling for

only three months, Ant. 20.9:1(203). A little later we read that the Levites persuaded the king, Agrippa, "to assemble a Sanhedrin" that they might be given permission to wear linen garments as well as the priests. The record states that it was granted by the permission of the king with the vote of the Sanhedrin, although the grant was contrary to the laws of the Jews, Ant. 20.9:6(218); 4.8:11(208). Florus also summoned the high-priests and the Sanhedrin, and placed the responsibility of quiet and order of thepeople upon them, War 2.15:6(331f). The Sanhedrin then could be given police duty. Permission for the people to send an embassy to Nero to protest against Florus had to be granted by theking and high-priests, War 2.16:3(342). This passage evidently assumes the Sanhedrin.

The council therefore was the connecting link as it were between the imperial government and the people, a representative of each to the other. The passages cited above also show that the Sanhedrin served as a buffer, receiving the complaints and sometimes the harsh treatment of either, Ant. 14.9:4(175).

The Sanhedrin council was made up of both Pharisees and Sadducees.[10] Since Josephus describes Sadduceeism as a sect among the wealthy, Ant. 13.10:6(298), and the wealthy as also men of power (see chapt III, sec. 3 of this study), we may assume that there were Sadducees in the council. We read that Ananus the high-priest and consequently head of the Sanhedrin was a Sadducee. The statement that Sadducees "are very rigid in judging offenders", Ant. 20.9:1(199), implies that they were members of the council. Sameas who is identified with Pollio

---

10. The Mishna speaks of Menahem, Jos. Ant. 15.10:5(373f), as the predecessor of Shammai in the ab bet din, religious Sanhedrin. This together with the nucleus of fact in Ant. 15.10:5(373f), and the statement in War 2.8:10(153) makes it probable that occasionally an Essene might be found in the Sanhedrin.

also a Pharisee was a member of the Jerusalem Sanhedrin, Ant. 14.9:4 (172). It is not probable that hw was the only Pharisee in the Jewish council. Pollio is mentioned no doubt as a member of the council when he advises the people to receive Herod, Ant. 15.1;1. If we would shut the Pharisees out of the Sanhedrin, we must account for their withdrawal from their political position during Alexandra's reign. Although the Pharisees are not mentioned as such during the Idumean period under Antipater as playing a dominant role in the councils, yet they thus appear both before and after in Alexandra's and in Herod's reigns respectively. The word "ἀριστοκρατία" refers then not to birth and rank but to the specific form of government that the Jews had. The "ἀριστοκρατία" must be understood as the Sanhedrin form of government over which the high-priest presided. The fact that the Sanhedrin had such a high place in Jewish life, and that the law also held a singular place among them argues for the Pharisees as members of the Sanhedrin because they were the people's leaders, expert in the law. The Sanhedrin was the national court of justice and before it causes that affected the entire civil life of the Jews were laid. Very early then the Pharisees highly versed in the law must have formed an important part of this ruling council. The people's usual ready submission to and reverence for their Sanhedrin in the light of Ant. 18.1:4(17) suggests that Pharisees occupied a large place in the Sanhedrin.

2. The Roman Imperial Control of Palestine.

Josephus says that Rome had no imperial ambition in securing possession and control of the Jewish nation. It was caused by the folly of the Jews themselves. We read: "whence did our servitude commence? Was it not derived from the seditious that were among our forefathers, when the madness of Aristobulus and Hyrcanus, and their mutual quarrels, brought Pompey upon this city, and when God reduced those under subjection to the Romans, who were unworthy of the liberty they had enjoyed?" War 5.9:4(395f); Ant. 14.4:5(77). If the Jews had trusted in God, He would nave thought them worthy of freedom and would have punished the Romans at once "when Pompey began to meddle with the nation", War 5.9:4(408).

In settling the affairs of the Jews Pompey seized Jerusalem, desecrated the Temple, made Hyrcanus high-priest, captured Aristobulus and his fimily, beheaded the authors of the disturbance, laid a tax upon the country and upon Jerusalem, deprived the Jews of the cities from Jewish control. In this characteristic Roman way he reduced "Judea within its proper bounds", War 1.7; Ant. 14.4; Ap. 2.11 (134). The tribute demanded amounted to more than 10,000 talents; and the royal authority vested in the family of the high-priest "became the property of private men", Ant. 14.4:5(78).

Our author speaks as though Rome's policy toward the Jews was lenient, Ap. 2.5(64); 2.6(72); Ant. 14.10:26(266); 16.6; Ap.2.11(134b). The Romans were glad to preserve the privileges of the Alexandrian Jews. The Jews elsewhere were granted the privileges of citizenship equally with others, Ap. 2.4(39f). Jerusalem of all cities was especially favored by the Romans, War Pref. 4(11). But such statements are balanced by the account of Pompey's treatment (see above),

Crassus' plundering of the Temple, Ant. 14.7:1, the recall of several prominent procurators, e.g. Pilate, Ant. 18.4:2, Felix, Ant. 20.8:9 (182), Albinus, Ant. 20.9:5(215), and the harsh treatment of the Jews by almost all governors. Of the procurators we read: "for that all governors are naturally disposed to get as much as they can, and that those who are not to fix (remain) there, but to stay a short time, and that in uncertainty when they shall be turned out, do the more severely hurry themselves on to fleece the people", Ant. 18.6:5(172); cf. (176). The Jews, no doubt, shared the prosperity of early Empire days under Augustus; and it is to be noted that the best things concerning Rome's treatment of the Jews are said about Julius Caesar and Octavius, Ant. 14.10; 16.6, and about our author's personal favorites, Vespasian and Titus. Also, under Agrippa I, who was appointed by Caius and increased in territorial power by Claudius, the Jews seemed to be fairly contented.

The imperial government kept strict military control of the Jews in Palestine. A popular movement, though seemingly peaceful and harmless, was promptly checked, War 2.13:4(260); 6.5:3(300f); Ant. 20. 5:1. The civil rulers were alert to any thing that might result in open hostility. Although the annual festivals were not discontinued, for that would have brought on immediate revolt, yet upon these occasions close watch was kept upon the assembled multitudes. When the people grew discontented under Herod I, he forbade them to "meet together, or to walk, or to eat together, but watched everything they did", Ant. 15.10:4(366). This motive of control lay below keeping the high-priest's garments in the Antonian tower. Herod began this custom "believing that while he had them in his custody, thepeople would make no innovations against him", Ant. 18.4:3(92). When Vitellius, governor of Syria, sent Marcellus to succeed Pilate as

procurator of Judea, he also restored the high-priest's garments to the care of the Jews. It seems that this was continued until the time of Fadus the procurator, when they were again placed in the Antonian tower, Ant. 20.1:1(6). In the context here too we read that the sacred vestments were an incitement to revolt. Orders to a procurator to quell revolt did not come officially from the Sanhedrin. As Rome's representative the procurator was empowered to maintain peace and order.

Then too there was frequent change of high-priests, (twenty-eight in one hundred and seven years, Ant. 20.10:1(250). The controling motive for Pompey's choice of Hyrcanus is characteristic, Ant. 14.4:4(73a). Each new settlement of possible or actual hostility was usually accompanied by a change of high-priest, Ant. 17.6:4(167); 17.9:1(207); 18.4:3(95); 19.8:1(342); 20.1:3(16); 8:8; 8:11(196); et al. If it could serve theppurposes of peace, the imperial government would sometimes reduce taxes, Ant. 15.10:4(365); 14.10:5(201). The levying of the taxes seems to have been placed in the hands of the chief representative of the imperial government, War 1.11:2(220f); Ant. 18.1:1(2). Florus' demand for "seventeen talents out of the sacred treasure" upon the pretense, says Josephus, that Caesar demanded them was probably the procurator's rash attempt to collect the overdue tribute, War 2.14:6(293); 2.16:5(403). With other favors too Rome sought to maintain peace, e.g. Herod's rebuilding of the Temple, general toleration of observance of the nation's religious customs, attention to the complaints of the people concerning the excesses of procurators, and large favors to individual Jewish rulers, e.g. Claudius' favors to Agrippa I, Ant. 19.5:1(274).

3. Various Jewish Attitudes toward the Roman Government.

Josephus says that revolt against Rome was not the will of the masses of the people. Upon specific occasions large groups of Jews, stirred by some particular violation of their customs, would for a moment rise up in protest, but the nation as a whole was slow to respond to what the Zealots and others regarded as the demands of patriotism. We read that the people were unwillingly engaged in the war with Rome, Ant. Pref. 2(6); Life 6(27); 11(46). When Petronius with threats urged the people to accept Caius' statue, they repoied: "We will not by any means make war with him, but still we will die before we see our laws transgressed", Ant. 18.8:3(271). The inhabitants of Sepphoris remained loyal to the Romans, Life 22(104); 65(346); Josephus affirms that the Jews are a peaceful people, Ap. 2.37(272); 2.32(235); 2.41(294). In his speech to the Jews in Jerusalem, when seeking to calm their hatred against Florus, Agrippa II assumes that the better and wiser part of the people desired to live in peace. It was principally the young enthusiasts who were desirous to force the issue, War 2.16:4(354f). When Florus demanded those who had insulted him with reproach for his greed, the rulers of the Jews begged him not to punish the greater number of innocent people because of the rashness of the guilty few, War 2.14:8(301f). When urged by their rulers to allay their anger against Florus, Josephus says: "the multitude complied immediately, out of reverence to those that had desired it of them, and out of the hope they had that Florus would do them no more injuries", War 2.15:2(317); cf. Ant. 18.1:1(3). The people were ready against the protest of the seditious to open the city gates to Cestius, War 2.19:6f. John of Gischala when in Jerusalem is reported as taking oath that he would be on thepeople's side,

War 4.3:13(214). Josephus speaks of the people with the rulers as fearing the consequences of the seditious in Jerusalem, War 2.17:10 (455f). The excesses of the seditious shocked the people when the former began to appoint their own high-priest, War 4.3:6(147); 7(151). Under Ananus, the high-priest, they were ready to oppose the Zealots, War 4.3:11(195); 4.6:3(377); 5.1:1-2(1-10); 4.3:9; 5.8:1(335f). If Josephus is correct that the people of Jerusalem protested against the excesses of the Zealots and were ready to submit to their rulers regardless of the conduct of Florus, we may assume that in the outlying districts where conditions were less feverish, the people were for the large part submissive, peacefully inclined, and very slow to revolt, regardless also of what they thought about the imperial government and their rulers in Jerusalem some of whom were time-servers.

The above passages and others given below indicate the attitude of the rulers, who for different and varying reasons desired peace. Much of their seeming submission was subservience to Rome, and that for a selfish purpose. The fact that the war was as much rebellion against the Jewish rulers as revolt against Rome points in this direction. Josephus is accused by Justus of being the author of the revolt in Galilee, Life 65(350). He defends himself against the charge. But the defense itself is damaging in thelight of such passages as War 3.8:6(387f); 9:6; 2.21:3; Life 5(23); 7(29); 27(132). The fact that the Zealots are reported as seeking to establish a high-priesthood and Sanhedrin of their own selection tells a tale, cf.chap. III, sec.3 of this study.

During the siege John of Gischala, who was leader of the Zealots, sent for help to the Idumeans charging Ananus the high-priest, and his party with treason, see War 4.4:1(225, 229). If the charge was not literally true, War 4.5:5(352), it at least points to such designs

as implied in the words: "And this (pretended agreement with the revolters) we did, hoping that Cestius would not be long ere he came, and that, with great forces, and so put an end to these seditious proceedings", Life 5(23), cf.War 4.7:3(414). Josephus himself always weakens his own defense. Besides, he was only one of a class of Romanized rulers in Jerusalem including Sadducees and some Pharisees.

The fourth philosophic sect, as Josephus calls the Zealots, was in violent opposition to Rome. They opposed the taxation under Cyrenius (Quirinius), and incited the people to take up arms against the Roman government. They recognized no king or lord but God. Josephus regards their position as bold, and one tending to disrupt the nation politically, socially and religiously, Ant. 18.1:1. The "sicarii" had a similar attitude toward Rome. Eleazar, their commander, a descendant of Judas the Gaulonite and commander of the Jews in Masada, War 7.8:1(253), in his speech just before the capture of the fortress by the Romans incites his soldiers to be brave, saying that they had long ago resolved never to be in bondage to Rome, but only to God, "who alone is the true and just Lord of mankind", War 7.8:6 (323). Some of the "sicarii" who had escaped to Alexandria, there stirred up the people "to assert their liberty" and to revolt against the Romans, and to regard "God as their only Lord and Master", War 7. 10:1(410f). Even their children refused to "name Caesar for their lord", War 7.10:1(419).

In recalling the nation's struggle Eleazar says that "the cause of liberty encouraged us all to revolt from the Romans", War 7.8:7(370), whether "sicarii", false prophets, and their followers, Zealots or Idumeans. In writing to the Idumeans for help the Zealots clearly state that they had revolted to preserve their liberty, War 4.4:1(228). In

replying to the speech of "Jesus the eldest of the high-priests" next to Ananus, War 4.4:3(238), Simon, son of Cathlas, a commander of the Idumeans, said that they would wait before the walls of Jerusalem to the Zealots until the Romanizing high-priest and his party should "become friends to liberty", War 4.4:4(282).

We have therefore the attitude of submission toward Rome by the people in general, together with some of their religious leaders, e.g. Ant. 15.1:1. No doubt, they knew that successful resistance against the Roman government could not be made. The nation was too small and too weak to secure or maintain independence against the world-ruling determination of the Roman Empire. But in the struggle a large part of the people became involved. As hostilities developed the people were drawn into the war. In determining the attitude, from Josephus' writings, of the Jewish people toward Rome it must be remembered that the rapid spread of zealotism [11] a passive intolerance, or at least, a submissive dissatisfaction. Many Jewish rulers were subservient to Rome for their own selfish interests. There were some Jews, and an increasing number, who could not refrain from attempting to throw off the Roman domination. They trusted in the help of God to free his people. In judging these we must remember that all we know about the Zealots, came from their opponents and was recorded by Josephus who, as one of the Zealots' opponents, was not in a state of mind to render a fair judgment of their earnest, self-sacrificing patriotism.

---

11. Jackson and Lake state that the Zealot party as suchmust not be identified with Josephus' fourth philosophic sect. The statement is striking since, as they say, it is generally assumed that the Zealot party began in 6 A. D. In the passages Ant. 18.1:1 and War 2.8 the Zealots are not mentioned. There is a close identification of the "sicarii" with the fourth sect, cf. Ant. 18.1:1(4); 6(23); War 2.8: 1(118); 7.8:1(253); 6(323); 10:1(410, 419). Points of resemblance may be seen between the fourth sect and the Zealots. The teaching of Judas

was accepted by young men; the Zealots under John were young men, Ant. 18.1;1(10); War 4.3;2(128). We note too that Judas was "zealous" to incite to revolt, Ant. 18.1;1(4).

Did the Zealot party begin with John? War 4.3f; cf. 2.22;1 (651); in the chapters following War 4.3 the Zealots are prior to the Idumeans. Yet elsewhere the Idumeans seem to be prior to the Zealots, War 7.8;1(267f). In War 4.3 Josephus does not say that the Zealot party began with John of Gischala.

It is a question whether Josephus always sharply distinguished one group from another. We read of a Jonathan, a sicarius assuming the role of a false prophet, War 2.13;4(259) and 7.11;1(438). Eleazar says the cause of liberty "encouraged us all to revolt", War 7. 8;7(370). But we may, with Jackson and Lake, say that "the fourth Philosophy supplied the intellectual attitude from which the Zealots and "sicarii" started; (Foakes-Jackson and Lake, the Beginnings of Christianity, Part I, Vol. 1, Appendix A, p.421f).

4. Reasons for the War of 66-73 A. D.

Josephus gives three causes for the war. They are seditious revolt, rash conduct of some procurators, especially Florus, and God's punishment upon the nation for its sin. These may be discussed in the order given.

In his speech to the revolters in Jerusalem Josephus says that in the nation's history revolt had never succeeded; but when Israel trusted in God, He delivered them. He says:"When did we even conquer any other nation by such means" (weapons)? He cites Abraham's victory over the king of Egypt who had seized "Queen Sarah", the exodus, the punishment upon the Syrians (Philistines, see I Sam. 6) for carrying away the ark, Sennacherib's punishment before Jerusalem (701 B.C., II Kgs. 19), the deliverance from exile under Cyrus (Ezra 1f.). Antiochus Epiphanes' defeat as historical evidences of God's protection of His people, War 5.9:4(375f).

In the account of the fourth philosophic sect it is reported that due to the rapid spread of its propaganda, war followed upon war, the aristocracy of the nation was robbed and murdered, seditions arose which resulted in the destruction of the Temple, the civil government was filled with tumult, the foundations of the nation's future miseries were laid, and the customs of the fathers were changed. The author says the "infection" spread among the young men, Ant. 18.1:1; War Pref. 4(10).

Elsewhere we read that John of Gischala came to Jerusalem, and by his harangues incited a large number of young men to war, War 4.3:2(128). The advance of the Romans in the north drove the seditious toward Jerusalem; and because Jerusalem by an ancient custom received

all Jews "without distinction", it became a place of refuge for all. This resulted in sedition in the city. Besides, the bands of refugees robbers were "the direct cause of the city's destruction" for with the sedition they also brought on a famine due to their injudicious use of the city's provisions, War 4.3:3(135-7). Elsewhere Justus of Tiberias is regarded as the author of the revolt in Galilee, Life 65 (341-4).

Some more immediate causes are mentioned. The people of Jerusalem had cut off the cloisters that joined the hated tower Antonia to the Temple. Tribute had not been paid, War 2.16:5(403). Soon afterward some revolters assaulted and captured the fortress Masada, killing the Roman garrison. Then, too, Eleazar son of Ananias the high-priest, persuaded the officiating priests of the Temple to receive no gift or sacrifice from any foreigner. This, says Josephus, "was the true beginning of our war with the Romans; for they rejected the sacrivice of Caesar on this account", War 2.17:2. Elsewhere we read that the defeat of Cestius by the Jews "became the calamity of our whole nation", Life 6(24). Then too the death of Ananus "was the beginning of the destruction of the city", War 4.5:2(318). The spirit of seditious revolt lies below all these causes.

During the procuratorships of Felix and Festus the affairs of the Jews steadily grew worse. The country was overrun by "robbers and impostors, who deluded the multitude", Ant. 20.8:5(160). These impostors urged the people to follow them into the wilderness, where "signs and wonders" would be performed by God. These prophets claimed to be under divine inspiration. "They prevailed with the multitude to act like madmen", says Josephus, War 2.13:4(259). Felix seized and punished them thinking it meant but the beginning of a revolt,

War 2.13:4(260).

At the same time a prophet from Egypt advised the common people to go with him to the Mount of Olives. He collected a band of 30,000. From the Mount of Olives they planned to break into Jerusalem by force. These too the soldiers of Felix attacked. The result was that the Egyptian escaped, but his followers were killed and captured, War 2. 13:5. The robbers also stirred up the people against the Romans, Ant. 20.8:6(167f).

At that time there was also a sedition or conflict between Syrians and Jews in Caesarea concerning equal rights to the privileges of citizens. Felix in quelling this sedition killed and captured many Jews, and allowed his soldiers to plunder the houses of the wealthy, Ant. 20.8:7. Felix was recalled by Nero. When the Jews went to Rome to accuse him before Nero, Josephus says that Felix would have been punished, had it not been for some of his friends, who persuaded Nero that an epistle be written annuling the equality of privileges of citizenship in Caesarea, which the Jews had enjoyed. "This epistle became the occasion of the following miseries that befell our nation"; for, when the Jews of Caesarea were informed of the contents of this epistle to the Syrians, they were more disorderly than before, till a war was kindled", Ant. 20.8:9(184).

The number of robbers and citizens who harbored and supported them, who were punished by Felix, was innumerable, War 2.13:2(253). But when some were put to death, others sprang up! After the band of Eleazar, an arch-robber, had been wiped out, the "sicarii" arose, Ant. 20.8:10(186f). The encounter with the prophet from Egypt was followed by more sedition. Robbers urged the people to assert their

liberty; and they killed those who refused to revolt. "And thus, says Josephus, "the flame was every day more and more blown up, till it came to a direct war", War 2.13:6(264).

Injustice and rash abuse of authority by the political government was another cause of the war. Josephus seems to trace the first immediate cause of the war to the action of Florus in connection with the trouble over the synagogue in Caesarea, for he says that the war began in the twelfth year of Nero's reign, and that the occasion, the action of Florus, of the war was not at all proportionate to the results, War 2.14:4f; cf. 19:4(531f). The excesses of Florus were no doubt one of the immediate causes. He is reported as desiring "to fan the war into a flame"by robbing the sacred treasury of seventeen talents. Instead of putting down the trouble in Caesarea, he marched upon Jerusalem with a large army, and by his insolent actions drove the Jews to desperate measures, War 2.14:6(293f). Elsewhere we read that Florus caused the Jews "to go wild with it (zealotism) by the abuse of his authority and to make them revolt from the Romans, Ant. 18.1:6(25). Our author summarises Florus' rule, upon this head by saying: "And what need I say any more upon this score? since it was this Florus who necessitated us to take up arms against the Romans, while we thought it better to be destroyed at once, than by little and little", Ant. 20.11:1(257).

The constant irritation, which the Jews suffered at the hands o rulers, and their mutual misunderstanding must inevitably have resulted in an outburst of revolt; and dissatisfaction with what the revolters regarded as pacifism and betrayal of national interests upon the part of some of their rulers resulted in rebellion. We speak of the

rough justice of the imperial government at Rome. There was also, at least occasionally, rough injustice and utter disregard for the peculiar interests of subjected peoples. Florus brought to a head what was the result of long years of suffering under the stern domination of Rome. His predecessors in abuse of authority were Caius, Ant. 18.8:2(261), Pilate, Ant. 18.3:1(55f), Felix under Nero, Ant. 20.8:7(173f), and Albinus, Ant. 20.11:1(252f); War 2.14:1(271f), his immediate predecessors, not to mention Herod I, Cassius and others. Under Nero with Felix, Festus, Albinus and Florus as procurators, we easily trace a rapid culmination of feeling for revolt, a feeling that definitely began in 6A. D. with the direct Roman taxation of Palestine.

Change in the political government due to the death of a ruler or the recall of a procurator sometimes led to attempts at revolt. The report that Herod I was dead added courage to the young men under Matthias and Judas to pull down the king's golden eagle from above the Temple gate, Ant. 17.6:3(155). After Herod's death some Jews banded togetherin protest against the death of Matthias and others. This protest was made to Archelaus, who succeeded his father Herod. While Archelaus was in Rome seeking the approval of Caesar upon his succession of his father Herod, Varus went to Jerusalem to quell the revolt, War 2.3:1f. About the same time there were disturbances in Idumea, Galilee, Perea, and throughout Judea, War 2.4,5. These passages disclose conditions which may be regarded as the beginning of the patriotic outburst. In the Preface of the War, Josephus adds that when the Roman affairs were insecure the Jews "arose when the times were disturbed." At the outbreak of the war, and upon the death of Nero "the affairs of the east were exceedingly tumultuous", and the Gauls, and Celtae in the West were astir, War Pref. 2(4-5).

The leaders of the insurrection thought there was a chance for Jewish independence because of Rome's weakness would prevent prompt and effective imperial action against any revolting province.

Finally, there was the belief that in the war God was punishing His people for their sin. Josephus says that in the first siege of Jerusalem, Cestius might have taken the city; but God already had an "aversion" toward the city and the Temple, and consequently prevented the war from coming to an end at that time, War 2.19;6(539). God caused the death of Ananus the high-priest and Jesus, because He had pronounced doom upon Jerusalem as a polluted city, and because He had determined to purge the Temple by fire, War 4.5;2(323); cf. 6.4;5(250). This was to be done by means of the Romans, War 5.9;4(412). The people's lack of trust in Him as their deliverer had brought His displeasure upon them, War 5.9;4(377,386,390,395f). The uncontrolable cruelty of some Roman soldiers even against the protest of Titus could not be prevented because "in reality it was God who condemned the whole nation", War 5.13;5(559). God rejected the city and Temple because of the wickedness of the seditious people and brought slavery upon the nation thereby desiring to make the people worse, Ant. 20.8;5(166).

Elsewhere we find the idea of fate in connection with the causes of the war. The city was blinded by fate and did not repent, War 5.13;7(572); but cf. War 5.9;4(415). Necessity forced the Jews into war, Life 6(27). When meeting the charges of Apion that the Jews "have neither just laws for worship God" as they ought to do, because if they did, they would not be in subjection to Gentiles, Josephus says that the "mutations in juman affairs" put peoples in subjection to others, Ap. 2.11(125f). In connection with this we may mention that in one passage the fall of Jerusalem, for the author, was the fulfillment of prediction. War 6.5.4(311)

Josephus perhaps utters his calmest and best judgment as to the cause of the war, when in defense of his nation he ways: "nor have we exerted our courage in raising up wars to increase our wealth, but only for the observation of our laws: and whereas we with patience bear other losses, yet when any persons would compel us to break our laws, then it is that we choose to go to war, though it be beyond our ability to pursue it, and bear the greatest calamities to the last with much fortutude", Ap. 2.37(272).

5. The Results of the War to Judaism.

Both Temple and city were utterly destroyed. The determined resistance of the besieged compelled Titus, says Josephus, to this destruction, War 7.5:2(113). Nothing could save the city, neither its great antiquity, nor its wealth, nor the fact that Jews were scattered over the habitable earth, nor the veneration the city received from strangers, War 6.10:1(441). Titus ordered that the entire city and Temple be razed to the ground. Only three towers and the west wall of the city remained for military purposes. In sad comment the author says: "This was the end which Jerusalem came to by the madness of those that were for innovations; a city of great magnificence and of mighty fame among all mankind", War 7.1:1(4). Not only was the Temple in Jerusalem destroyed, but shortly afterward, according to Josephus, the Jewish Temple at Leontopolis in Egypt was plundered and thereupon closed because of the "sicarii", War 7.10:4.

The Romans disposed of the captives in their usual manner. When Jotapata early in the war was taken by surprise after a siege, the Romans killed all whom they found and searched the underground recesses for others. They spared only the infants and women, numbering about twelve hundred. Vespasian ordered that the city be destroyed, and all the fortifications be burned, War 3.7:36(338). Joppa suffered a similar fate, War 3.9:1-3(409-427). The fate of some of the captives of Tarichaea was strikingly cruel. They were ordered to Tiberias, and there in the presence of Vespasian the old men and those who were useless were put to death. Six thousand of the strongest young men were sent to Nero, and the remainder were sold into slavery. Some were given as a present to Agrippa, War 3.10:10(537f).

Deserters to the Romans were put to death or sold into slavery.

But due to the large number of those sold, sometimes citizens were given permission to go free, War 6.8:2(386). Just before the final overthrow of the city, when Titus already occupied a part of the city, he ordered that only those who offered opposition and the aged and infirm should be slain. The rest should be captured. The seditious were usually killed; but the young men with handsome physique were kept for the triumph. Others were sent to the Egyptian mines. Still others were sent to the provinces to be destroyed in the theatres by sword and beasts. Those under seventeen years of age were sold as slaves, War 6.9:2(417); cf.7.2:1(24); 3:1(37).

About the time the war began there arose a strong feeling of anti-Semitism throughout Palestine and elsewhere.[12] Josephus mentions evidences of it in Syria, War 7.3-2(41f); Ant. 20.8:7(173f).[13] After the war Titus, upon approaching Antioch in Syria, was met by its citizens begging him to rid their city of the Jews. Titus however did not grant their request. The Jews of Antioch continued in the privileges which they had previously enjoyed, War 7.5:2(111).

The taunt of Apion that the Jews were ever in subjection to others, and that their city had been subject to "several calamities" was probably fresh upon the lips of their enemies after the destruction of the city by Titus. Josephus, no doubt, has his contemporary enemies in mind when he answers this charge, Ap. 2.11(125f), as though it came from Apion, cf. War Prof. 1(2). There was plenty of precedent for the taking of Jerusalem by Titus, e.g. by Nebuchadrezzar, Ptolemy

---

12. Norman Bentwich, Josephus, p. 211, says: "The bitterest and the most envenomed attacks on the Jews were written after the destruction of Jerusalem, when the failure of Rome to break the stubborn spirit of her conquered foe became apparent."

13. Foakes-Jackson and Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity, Part I, Vol. I, P.28: "The growing unpopularity of the Jews among the neighboring population was one of the chief causes of the outbreak of the subsequent war".

Lagus, Antiochus the Great, Pompey and Herod I, see Ant. 10.6;3(96); 8;1f(131); 12.1; 5;3(246); 14.4;2(58f); 16;1(468). But we must remember if ever an apology for the Jews was needed, it was after 70 A. D.; Josephus is not meeting new charges in Apion, but old charges revived with the new misfortune that had come to his people. Apologies are strictly occasional and designed to meet contemporary adverse charges and conditions. Thus it is highly probable that this specific charge of subjection and the specific mention of the city's downfall placed upon the lips of Apion were anew used by the enemies of the Jews after 70 A. D., Ap. 1.1(2f). The apologetic character of the War suggests a wave of anti-Semitism after the great revolt. The author protests against the garbling of the facts of the war by Gentile historians, Ap. 2.8f; 2.10(56); War 2.16;4(399).

The high-priest's office evidently ceased with the destruction of the city. Josephus, enumerating the high-priests, gives their number to the downfall of the city and the Temple. He gives a summarized statement of this number from Aaron with whom the high-priesthood began, and closes by saying that from Herod I to Titus the Jews had had twenty-eight high-priests. The statement that after Herod I and Archelaus the government became an aristocracy and that "the high-priests were entrusted with a dominion over the nation" does not imply that the high-priests continued to function thus after 70 A. D., Ant. 20.10;1(251).

When certain of the Jewish nobility escaped out of the besieged Jerusalem to the Romans, Caesar ordered them to Gophna, promising to restore their possessions to them after the war, War 6.2;2(114f). But the reference is to personal property and not to official position. There is therefore nothing specific and clear regarding the organ-

ization and administration of the Jews after the downfall of Jerusalem.

Josephus closes the account regarding Judea's fate by telling us that Bassus (following Cerealis, Life 75; War 7.6:1(163) was appointed procurator, War 7.8:1(252); 7.6:1(163); 7.6:6(216). Caesar ordered Judea to be sold, Life 76(425). He built no city there, but only stationed a guard of 800 men in Emmaus near the site of Jerusalem. A tax was levied upon all Jews everywhere. The two drachmae that had been sent to the Temple of Jerusalem annually were ordered to be sent to Rome. Josephus closes by saying: "And thus was the state of the Jewish affairs at this time", War 7.6:6(218).

The author, however, supplements his seemingly concluding statement by a chapter on the capture of Masada, War 7.8, and a description of further trouble in Alexandria and Cyrene caused by "sicarii" who had fled from Judea. But we do not read of any reorganization of the Jewish nation under a high-priesthood.[14] Silva is mentioned as the successor of Bassus as procurator of Judea, War 7.8:1(252). With this the account of Judea's fate closes.

---

14. E. Schürer, Geschichte, r.s.w. 4 Aufl. Vol I, p.652f; "Eine gewaltige Umwalzung brachte die zerstorung Jerusalems fur das innere Leben des jüdischen Volken mit sich. Kein Synedrium und kein Opferdienst mehr, u.s.w.

CHAP. III. THE SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND CONDITIONS OF JUDAISM.

1. Number and Distribution of the Jews in Palestine.

Cestius Gallus, governor of the province of Syria, is reported to have requested the high-priests to take a census of their nation. This was done at a Passover feast, when 256,500 paschal lambs were prepared. Allowing one lamb to a minimum of ten persons ceremonially pure the number of people amounted to 2,700,200. Besides there were the ceremonially impure and foreigners, War. 6.9:3(421f).

We read also that during the entire war 97,000 were captured and 1,100,000 perished in battle,[1] by pestilence, and by famine. The majority of this 1,100,000 were Jews. This vast number of 2,700,200 and more was shut up in the city during the siege, War.6.9:3(419,423).

In another passage upon a visit of Cestius Gallus to Jerusalem during Passover week, not fewer than 3,000,000 people are reported to have petitioned him to rid them of Florus, their procurator, War 2. 14:3(280).

War 6.9:3(421f) has some relation to War 2.14:3(280). Cestius Gallus figures in both passages. The request was probably made by Cestius when he visited Jerusalem during a Passover. The number 2, 700,200 can be only approximate since from ten to twenty might partake of one paschal lamb. Since it is based upon a little over the minimum for each lamb, excluding also the ceremonially impure, the larger number 3,000,000 is possibly the approximate total number at that Passover, War 2.14:3(280).

Of course, this number and even more were not "shut up by fate, as in prison", in the city of Jerusalem even though Josephus expressly says: "And that this city could contain so many people in it is

---

1. Tacitus, Hist. V,13, places the number at 600,000 (sexcenta millia).

manifest by that number of them, which was taken under Cestius". Besides of the 2,700,200 or 3,000,000 some may have come from countries outside Palestine, so that neither passage can be relied upon as giving us even the approximate number of Jews in Palestine. The passages are altogether unreliable for computing the total number of Jews in Palestine and in the diaspora.

As to the distribution of the Jews over Palestine, we arrive at almost equally negative results. The Jews were principally agricultural. Thus the description of the contour and suitability of the districts of Palestine for farming may furnish a rough general estimate. Galilee was the best of all the districts including Perea, Samaria and Judea. Of the Galilees Josephus says that "the cities lie very thick, and the very many villages there are here and everywhere so full of people, by the richness of their soil that the very least of them contained above 15,000 inhabitants, War 3.3;2(43); cf. Life 45(235). A very conservative estimate based upon the above passages would give us 3,600,000 people in the cities and villages of Galilee. We may assume that if Josephus had given a proportionate estimate for Samaria and Judea - for "each of them are very full of people", War 3.3;4(50) - and likewise for Perea, the figures would have been proportionately exaggerated. Besides, we are seeking to determine only the Jewish population of the districts. Josephus only in the case of Judea's population mentions Jews as distinct from Syrians, War 3.3;5(57). The term used for the population of the other districts is simply "people". All we can say for the passages is that Galilee led in population, Samaria and Judea came next and Perea was least populated. They tell us nothing about Jews east of the Jordan outside of Perea.[2]

2. The figures in War 6.9;3(419.423), 2.14.3(280), 3.3.2(43) are

Cont on next page.

attempts to make the Jews seem a numerically great people, and Palestine a very fruitful and fertile agricultural country. E. W. G. Masterman, Studies in Galilee, p.131f. says concerning Josephus' estimate of Galilee's population: "To the great majority of those who have looked into the question the statements of Josephus are, as they stand, manifestly absurd. The numbers may be a wilful exaggeration, which considering they were so easy of refutation, seems hardly possible; or the statement about the 15,000 is misplaced by an error in copying and ought to apply to the cities only". Elsewhere, p.134, "If there be reckoned 200 small towns and villages with a population together of 200,000, and the four great cities (see p.133) with an equal population of 200,000, we get 400,000 as the probable population of Galilee in the time of Christ etc. ..... and it is probable this estimate errs on the side of excess."

2. Hellenistic Influence upon the Palestinian Jews.

That the Herods and the Agrippas and their courts were Hellenistic scarcely needs proof. Herod I's building operations, including the theatre and amphitheatre in and just outside Jerusalem respectively, the pagan temples in honor to Caesar, his Olympian games held every five years, his famous palace in Hellenistic design, the educating of his sons at Rome, and later marrieging them to foreigners, the maintenance of Greek writers at his court, his own mixed marriages, the presence of non-Jewish mercenary troops in his army, all these are indicative, Ant. 15.8:1; War 1.22:2(435); 1.28:4(562); 1.4:3(88); 1.18:3(354). He only carried on the attempt of Hellenizing the Jews begun by his father Antipater. We find Herod I's sons, Antipas and Philip following the example of their father. Philip built Caesarea, and Herod Antipas, Tiberias in Galilee, War 2.9:1.

In spirit and purpose the Agrippas were no less Hellenizers. Of Agrippa I Josephus says: "He was not at all like that Herod who reigned before him; for that Herod was ill-natured, and severe in his punishments, and had no mercy on them that he hated; and every one perceived that he was more friendly to the Greeks than to the Jews" etc. "But Agrippa's temper was mild and equally liberal to all men. He was humane to foreigners, and made them sensible of his liberalities, but even yet more charitable and sympathetic to his kinsmen", Ant. 19.7:3; cf. 19.7:5; 19.8:2.

But the royal houses to some extent respected the customs of Judaism. Polemo, king of Cilicia became a Jew before he married Berenice, Ant. 20.7:3(145-6); 11.7:1(139). Herod I rebuilt the Temple. Agrippa I was careful in ritual observance. However, when occasion-

and desire demanded, they did not hesitate to set aside the Jewish law, Ant. 15.7:10(259); 17.13:1(341); 18.2:3(38); 20.7:2. Josephus says Herod I excused his disregard for the nation's customs and laws by pretending that it was done at the command of others to please Caesar and the Romans. But, he continues, it was the result of his overweining ambition. Yet, elsewhere Josephus concedes for Herod the pressure of Rome, Ant. 15.9:5(328, 330). In connection with this the statement is made that Herod did not build cities and temples in Judea for that would have been intolerable, Ant. 15.9:5(328-9). In the preceding chapter, however, the author has just finished telling us of Herod's Hellenizing exploits in Jerusalem, Ant. 15.8:1f.

It is difficult to determine how far the rulers of the Jews yielded to the Hellenizing activities of the royal house, and the encroachments of Hellenism under the procurators. There were protests by the citizens of Jerusalem sometimes under the leadership of prominent teachers, cf. Chap. IV sec.2; War 2.9:1-4; but this is not indicative of the attitude of the official rulers. The Sadducees in the first century A. D. were a part of the ruling class in Jerusalem, Ant. 20.9:1f; et al. They are usually referred to as "οἱ δυνατοί". They were the party to which Hyrcanus I joined himself after his rupture with the Pharisees. This he did by setting aside the observances that the Pharisees had given to the people, and he threatened to punish those who observed them, Ant. 13.10:6. After the time of Hyrcanus I, except during the time of Alexandra when the Pharisees were in power, the Sadducees, especially under the long high-priesthood of Hyrcanus II, had a large measure of power, Ant. 14.4:4; 14.8:5; 14.10:2. In their position they assumed the attitude of "give and take".

That their power was seriously curtailed under Herod I is not stated. Herod I put to death forty-five of the Antigonus party, Ant.

15.1:2(6); but nevertheless retained Hyrcanus as high-priest for a time. It is probable that the Sadducees of Hyrcanus' party were committed to the Idumean policy by the marriage of Herod I to Mariamne, his favorite wife, the grand-daughter of Aristobulus, War 1.17:8(344). It was, at least, a step toward reconciling the remnants of the Hasmoneans to Herod. It was the ambition of Herod to unite in himself the Hasmonean house and the Idumean house by his marriage to Mariamne. He sought to continue the union of the two houses by espousing members of either to the other, War 1.28:2f. Antipater his son on the Idumean side was married to a daughter of the slain Mariamne. Josephus quotes Herod as saying, when pairing his children off among each other: "and I pray God that he will join these children together in marriage to the advantage of my kingdom, and of my posterity". Although the policy of Herod was not successful, Ant. 15.9:3(319), the Hasmonean priesthood finally being dissolved, yet this dissolution did not mean a cessation of Sadducean power, for under Albinus the procurator, they are still in power. And from Hyrcanus I to and into the period of the great revolt, 66 A. D., they are not the people's choice, but rather the friends of their political masters, War.2.16:2.(336).

Nor can we precisely fix the extent of Hellenistic influence upon the Pharisees especially if we include the Pharisees outside Jerusalem. That some in Jerusalem were influenced is evident. Josephus of Sadducean lineage yet claiming to have accepted "the rules of the Pharisees", Life 2(12), is a good example, and we may assume, not a single exception. He is a striking example, but nevertheless, his Hellenistic tendencies are only indicative of a blending of interests of the Sadducees and some Pharisees in Jerusalem. His writings both

in style and expression, the neutralization of features in Judaism objectionable to his Greek readers, his wearisome flattery of, and excuse for Roman policy and patronage, the soiling of his writings, especially the War, by his hostile criticism of the Zealots, all these are an indirect protest against his people for their loyal adherence to their traditional faith, and to their unwillingness to assimilate and accomodate themselves to the surrounding Hellenism. Hölscher labors with the passages in which Josephus seems to be at the same time a Pharisee and an intimate friend of the high-priests. He regards all these passages as interpolations, if the sharp distinction between Phariseos and the high-priestly family representing Sadducees is to be maintained,[3] War 2.17:3(411); Life 5(21); 39(195f); 38, 44, 60.

But why not say that some Pharisees in Jerusalem and Sadducees politically and socially were sharing interests? The Idumean policy and Rome were accomplishing the consolidation. Political and religious control was distributed to whom Rome would give it, Ant. 20.10:1(249). There were Pharisees in the Sahhedrin. The fact that the selfishly ambitious Herod I yielded to and favored the people and their religious leaders, e.g. in rebuilding the Temple, suggests compensation for doing so. Passages such as War 2.17:3f; 6.5:3(291f); Ant.19.7:3(331) indicate that some Pharisees retaining their Judaism, nevertheless under the stress of the times gave way and began to regard Hellenistic culture and civilization with favor. All that our author says about the Pharisees, when comparing their teachings and position as leaders of the people with the teaching and position of the Sadducees, does not exclude the possibility and probability of a degree of Hellenizing on the part of some Pharisees, especially on the part of some in the larger

---

3. G. Hölscher, Der Sadduzaismus, p.39.

centres of population, to Hellenistic influences. On the other hand it is clear that the Pharisees generally remained firm in their Judaism, Ant. 19.7:4(332); 20.2:4(43). 17.6:2f; 15.10:4.

Such Pharisees were true representatives of the people's attitude. What our author says about Jewish education (see Chap. 4,secs. 5-6), devotion of the people to worship at both Temple and synagogue,and devotion to the Sabbath, and his presentation of the faith of standard Judaism (see Chap.5), as also his presentation of the daily life and pursuits of the people, Chap. 3.sec. 6, would lead us to conclude that Hellenistic influences did not seriously penetrate the life of the orthodox masses.[4] That they found themselves surrounded by these influences, and perforce were sometimes compelled to yield, e.g. in the use of coins, does not argue that they willingly yielded. The great revolt proves the contrary.

The first century marks the rise and extinction of the Zealot movement, as a definite movement, Ant. 18.1:1(1-10). But in this time it spread with amazing rapidity in various forms. Josephus says: "the nation was infected with them", filling "our civil government with tumults." This passage, Ant. 18.1:1, is his calmest criticism of Zealotism.

In these seditious times the Pharisees no longer appear on the scene in a body as they did in Alexandra's reign. Instead some are constantly advising submission to Rome, sometimes unwittingly perhaps, yet at the expense of religious principles which they more than all

---

4. P. Krüger, Hellenismus und Judentum p.28: "Griechentum und orthodoxes Judentum sind keine Verbindung miteinander eingegangen."

others had inculcated. Often it was left to the multitudes, misguided and violent to express once again their undying hatred of an encroaching world spirit, and on the other hand, their inherent loyalty to their national cause and hopes. Zealotism is a violent protest against what the people regarded as the indifference of the nation's constituted leaders to offset and oppose the intrusions of a bold paganism, Ant. 18.1:1; see Chap. 3, sec.3. Josephus is unsophisticated enough to give us this impression.

In one passage we read: "for as to the Grecians, we are rather remote from them in place than different from them in our institutions", Ap. 2.10(123). But this should be regarded as apologetic, for elsewhere we read: "whereas we, though we do not think fit to imitate others", (Margoliouth: "other institutions"), Ap. 2.36(261). The cumulative evidence, inferential and direct, of the Antiquities and the War compels us to regard the latter statement as historically correct, if by "we" the people as a whole be understood. Among them, the Palestinian Jews, we can scarcely trace any Hellenistic influence.

3. The Aristocracy and the Common People.

There is clearly a class consciousness indicated in first century Judaism as presented by Josephus. In all his writings we may trace it. In his autobiography he answers first of all the charge against him of low birth. He is very proud of his ancestry. Nobility among the Jews was sacerdotal. In his speech to the besieged revolters in Jerusalem, he remihds them of the danger to his family, which was "by no means ignoble", and for a long time very eminent, War 5.9:4(419). Moreover he was of royal blood on his mother's side. With haughty curtness he dismisses the charge against him. Moreover there being "considerable difference between one family of each course (priestly courses) and another", Life 1(1); cf. Ant. 18.8:9; 9.3, Josephus claims that he is "of the chief family of that first course."

In Apion the priesthood is described as a noble class apart from the "Am-haarets". They possess this nobility by divine right. It was God who so ordained it, Ap. 2.21(185). Priests in marrying must not allow wealth, or "any other dignities" to be their primary consideration, Ap. 1.7(31). Then too the priests first chosen by Moses were not chosen for their riches or "any accidental gifts of fortune", Ap. 2.21(186). They were given their office because of their ability to rule, and because of their high character. To them was entrusted "the main care of the law and of the other parts of the people's conduct, Ap. 2.21(187).

With so much power entrusted by divine command to the priests, and in favorable political situation, we can easily see how with the aid of the priesthood there could readily develop a class among the Jews called an "ἀριστοκρατία", many of the class being priests. We

are not permitted to say that all priests belonged to this class, but rather that many in the center of Jewish political activity, Jerusalem, were of the aristocracy. Relative to Ap. 2.21(185) above, we may say that a similar injunction, namely, not to marry for dowry, was laid upon all Jews, Ap. 2.24(200). The description of the priesthood in Apion 1.7(31) and 2.21(186) is a eulogy rather than a carefully weighed historical statement of Judaism's first century priesthood. Statements in Apion must sometimes be compared with conditions depicted in the War and Antiquities in order to get at the facts.

The testimony of the author regarding the Sadducees points to the existence of an aristocracy over against the people. They are able to persuade "only the rich, those of the greatest dignity", Ant. 13.10:6(298); 18.1:4(17). In passages too numerous to mention we find the phrases "the principal men", "the men of power", "eminent men" as separate from the masses.

The Zealots were charged with plundering and killing the principal men among the Jews. They claimed patriotic motives for their deeds, and regarded the wealthy principal men as their enemies, Ant. 18.1:1(7). At the beginning of the war some "sicarii" came into Jerusalem during the festival of Xylophory, and set fire to the house of Ananias, the high-priest, and to the building where the public records were kept, burning the contracts of creditors, thereby dissolving the obligation of paying debts. They did this to persuade the poorer people to make war upon the wealthier. Josephus speaks of these records as "the nerves of the city". The "sicarii" thereupon attacked the "men of Power" and the high-priests, some of whom escaped into underground vaults, War 2.17:6; 4.3:4(138, 141f).

Again the elders and those in authority fled to the Romans to

beg for aid against the seditious who were threatening the city with disruption, War 3.9:8(453f). In this passage we have a class of rulers against the seditious, with the masses of people apart from both. Josephus says that the Zealots sought out chiefly the "men of good families and the brave". Because of this, they put Gorion to death, "a person eminent in dignity, and on account of his family also". They attempted to wipe out entirely the ruling class in Jerusalem. None escaped "unless he were very inconsiderable, either on account of the meanness of his birth, or on account of his fortune", War 4.6:1.

When Vespasian attacked Gadara the "men of power"sent an embassy to Vespasian to surrender the city, desiring to save their property, for many of the citizens of Gadara were wealthy. For sending this embassy Dolesus of first rank and family in the city was put to death by the seditious, War 4.7:3(414f).

Josephus in lamenting over the distress of the times says: "the men of power oppressed the multitude, and the multitude earnestly labored to destroy the men of power". The one part were desirous of tyrannizing over others, and the rest of those offering violence to others, and of plundering such as were richer than themselves", War 7.8:1(260f). The Idumeans vied with the"sicarii"by murdering the high-priests seeking thereby utterly to destroy the Jewish government, War 7.8:1(267).

The Idumeans went to the extent of setting up a court before which they tried Zacharias, an eminent, wealthy citizen of Jerusalem, in order that they might seize his property, and also rid the city of one who "had great power to destroy them". The seventy judges chosen from the "principal men" of the city, but simply for sham purposes, returned a verdict of "not guilty". They were thereupon beaten, and

barely escaped with their lives. Zacharias was put to death by two Zealots in the court-room, War 4.5:4.

We find those of the better sort, the high-priests, Joseph and Jesus, four sons of Matthias, "the son of the other Matthias and three of his sons" and many others of the nobility surrendering to the Romans. Caesar promised to restore their possessions to them after the war. Until that time they retired to Gophna, War 6.2:2(113f); cf. 2. 20:1(556). When the high-priests, men of power, and the Sanhedrin had congratulated Agrippa at Jemnia upon his safe return from Alexandria, they told him of the barbarous treatment they had received from Florus. The account continues that Agrippa in pretense rebuked the Jews, which pretense "these great men (those mentioned above) as of better understanding than the rest (the people), and desirous of peace because of the possessions they had, understood that this rebuke which the king gave them was intended for their good", War 2.16:2(336f).

It is probable that discrimination by political rulers in favor of the priesthood and those connected with Temple worship was sometimes made, Ant. 11.5:1(128); 12.3:3(142); Life 76(429). The above facts indicate that the war of 66 A. D. was a sedition against the Jewish aristocracy as well as a revolt against Rome, and that the evidence is damaging for the Jewish rulers. There is one thing clear, in Josephus, namely that the people in general thought, and the Zealots and their kind said that their rulers had sold out to the Roman political machine.

4. The Social Aspect of the Temple.

The historical factors which led to Jerusalem becoming the central place of worship for the Jewish nation are not mentioned by Josephus. The centralization of worship at Jerusalem was regarded as the result of a direct command from God through Moses to the people. The national polity was settled by Moses for all future generations. When Israel had come into Canaan, there should be one city located on a favorable site "eminent in itself", which God by prophetic revelation should choose, Ant. 4.8:5. There was to be one altar there of unhewn stones, and one Temple. Nor should Israel erect altars elsewhere, since "God is but one, and the nation of the Hebrews is but one."

That the social aspects of temple worship were not unknown is very evident from the statement relative to the purpose of the command that Hebrews should appear before the face of Jehovah three times a year. The passage is colored by first century conditions prevailing at the three great yearly festivals. It reads: "Let those that live as remote as the bounds of the land which the Hebrews shall possess, come to that city where the Temple shall be, and this three times in a year, that they may give thanks to God for his former benifits, and may entreat him for those they shall want hereafter; and let them by this means maintain a friendly correspondence with one another, by such meetings and feastings together; for it is a good thing for those that are of the same stock, and under the same institution of laws, not to be unacquainted with each other; which acquaintance will be maintained by thus conversing together, and by seeing and talking with one another, and so renewing the memorials of this union, for if they do not thus converse together continually, they will appear like mere strangers to one another", Ant. 4.8:7. The passage needs no comment.

It is evident that also for first century Judaism the three great yearly festivals, joyous as all were did much to maintain the consciousness of social, racial, and religious solidarity among the Jews. It was usually at these annual festivals that sedition broke out, War 1.4;3(88); 5.3;1; 5.5;8(244). The Roman government was alive to the danger lurking in the social contact of Jews gathered together from almost the entire Mediterranean world. Fired with religious zeal and enthusiasm, at these yearly pilgrimages to their sacred capital, their accumulated and aroused national piety often burst forth in protest against what they regarded as encroachment upon and curtailment of their national rights and interests. Here in their holy city during these festivals Jew could meet Jew and on common ground could talk over common interests.

It was the custom of the Roman governors to station detachments of soldiers near the cloisters of the Temple and elsewhere, Ant. 20.5:3(106-7); cf. War 1.13;3(253). It is said that the procurator Cumanus only followed the example of his predecessors in doing so.[5] The citizens of Jerusalem had become accustomed to some conditions which those who only visited the city upon special occasions could not tolerate, War 2.9:2(170). Josephus says that at critical times many came to the feasts not so much for worship as for patriotic action, War 2.3;1(42). On one occasion "the greatest part of those coming out of the country to the festival called Pentecost came ermed", War 1.13:5(253f); cf. Ant. 20.8:5(164f). At a certain feast of Tabernacles the crowds left the feast, and took up arms to fight, War 2.19:2(517). The multitudes besieged in the city during the last siege had gathered there to celebrate the Passover.

5. See Shilleto: The Works of Fl. Jos. Vol. III, p.392, foot note.

Josephus distinctly mentions four courts of the Temple, Ap. 2. 8(103f). The description of these courts is simpler and clearer in Apion than in the War and the Antiquities, although the latter two accounts are more detailed, War 5.5;2(190f); Ant. 15.11;5. All the passages agree upon four courts. There is first the court into which both Jews and non-Jews were allowed to go, Ap. 2.8. This was regarded as part of the Temple area since Josephus says when reporting the answer of Zerubbabel to the Samaritans that "it was lawful for them to come and worship there if they pleased", since it was granted to all to come to the Jews' Temple to worship God, Ant. 11.4;3(87). This answer accords with what the author says about the charge of " " against the Jews, see Ap. 2.36.

Each court had a "peculiar degree of separation from the rest". The sanctuary proper lay within the court of the Gentiles. Upon its outer wall stood pillars upon which the "law of purity" was inscribed, forbidding a foreigner to pass into the sanctuary upon pain of death, War 5.5;2(194); Ant. 15.11;5(417). In the first court of the sanctuary Jews with their wives were allowed to assemble. This is distinctly stated in two passages, Ap. 2.8(104); Ant. 15.11;5(418). The men only were permitted to go farther inward. This court for Jewish men only is called in Apion the third court; and in War and Antiquities, the inner court. Beyond the inner court the priests only were allowed to go; that is, into the fourth court. Beyond the fourth court was the "most sacred place" admitting only the high-priest.

Josephus charges Apion with a falsehood in saying that the Jews take oath by God, creator of heaven, earth, and sea, to show no good will to foreigners, particularly the Greeks, Ap. 2.10. He distinctly asserts that because the Greeks live far distant from the Jews, the Jews have no reason to be inimical toward or jealous of them. On the

contrary the Jewish laws enjoin "a general love of mankind", Ap. 2.14. Yet elsewhere he indirectly admits a measure of exclusiveness, but only such as is common to other peoples. He cites Plato as prohibiting the promiscuous intercourse of his people with strangers. That Jews will have no social fellowship with other peoples is not peculiar to them. The Lacedemonians expelled foreigners, and forbade their people to travel abroad thinking that social intercourse with others "would introduce a dissolution of their laws". No foreigners were given citizenship among the Lacedemonians, nor were they allowed to settle in Lacedemonian territory. But the Jews were not hesitatnt about accepting those who desired to adopt the Jewish religion, Ap. 2.36.

There is sufficient evidence to support a measure of fact in his apology. In contrast with attendance upon heathen temples, many having been abandoned, innumerable crowds from the entire Mediterrancan world hastened to Jerusalem for the festivals,[6] War 6.9:3; 2.1:3(10). Foreigners, however, were not given a vital share in the worship, e.g. partaking of the Paschal sacrifices, but nevertheless they came to worship, War 6.9:3(426); cf. Ant. 18.2:2(30).

In numerous passages we may see that much of Jerusalem's life centered at the Temple. The six festivals (see Chap. 5, sections 1 & 5), not including the annual day of atonement, were temple occasions. The "friendly correspondence" and "feastings", Ant. 4.8:7(203), of the three great festivals no doubt characterized the others. We may infer that the separate courts of the Temple were designed not with a

---

6. Commenting on the abandonment of pagan temples, Ap. 2.35(254). Müller quotes a part of Pliny's well known letter to Trajan, Epist. X, XCVIII. 10: "Certe satis constat, prope jam desolata templa coepisse celebrari, et sacra solemnia diu intermissa repeti etc." - J. G. Müller, Fl. Jos. gegen Apion, p. 345.

view to shutting the people out of the Temple area but for ceremonial necessity due to the crowds that constantly gathered there. The chief evidence that the Temple was the forum or public square of the community, is not a passage or more, e.g. Ant. 17.6:3(155), but the cumulative impression from narratives dealing with events in Jerusalem. For example, one is led to think that the last great revolt occurred in the Temple area.

It was in or near the Temple area that the high-priest exercised his political functions and the Sanhedrin met. We read: "The high-priests assembled the multitude in the Temple", War 2.15:3(320). Agrippa went up to the Temple and called the multitude together there, War 2.16:2(340-1). In the context presumably the same multitude addressed the king and the high-priests, After conference with the high-priests the men of power and some Pharisees "assembled the people before the brazen gate, which was that gate of the inner Temple", War 2. 17:3(411f). The people also under the unwilling leadership of their officials "got together in great numbers in the Temple to choose generals, War 2.20:3(562); 4.3:10(162). While the Zealots with the Idumeans occupied the Temple area, they held a mock tribunal, quite probably, in the court of the Sanhedrin, War 4.5:4.

The context of the Judas and Matthias affair leads us to think that these teachers also taught their pupils somewhere in the Temple area, Ant. 17.6:2f; War 1.33:2f. When a report came that Herod had died, about noonday, they pulled down the golden eagle over the great gate of the Temple. They seem to be in the vicinity of the great gate. The trophy had been perhaps a daily irritation to them as they taught. There is however nothing in either passage to allow a positive statement regarding their place of instruction. To give us this information

was not Josephus' main concern.

5. The Social Aspect of the Synagogue.

The synagogue was used for other purposes besides worship. It was the Jews' social and civic center. To it the people gathered whenever there were collective interests to be discussed. At Tiberias, in the first hour of the day, the whole multitude was assembled in the "Proseucha",(house of prayer), for political conference. It was there too that Jews conducted their law suits and controversies, Ant. 14.10: 17(235). Over each synagogue was a ruler, whose duties are not specifically described, but who had general charge of all the assemblies, Life 54(278); 57(295).

Not only were the books of Scripture found there, but also the synagogue served as a treasury for the money to be sent to Jerusalem, Ant. 16.6;2(163). It served as a temporary storehouse for the first-fruits preparatory to carrying them to Jerusalem, Ant. 16.6;6(171). Here too the Jews gathered on festive occasions and brought contributions for "common suppers and holy festivals". The people assembled here bringing with them also the oblations necessary for sacrifices, Ant. 14.10;8(214); 12(227).

6. Agriculture the Chief Occupation.

Josephus regarded his people as an agricultural nation. This accounted partly for their exclusiveness. The country was not maritime and there was little commerce and foreign trade. The Jews of Palestine were not inclined to trading with others, nor to the social contact it involved. Business and industry were limited in kind and amount. The people were content to cultivate the land, and pasture their flocks and herds, Ap. 1.12. But elsewhere we read that the sea ports of Judea extend as far as Ptolemais,[7] and that the country was not without "such delights as come from the sea", War 3.3:5(52). On the other hand our author quotes Hecataeus who described Judea (Palestine) as "generally excellent and most fruitful soil", extensive and of excellent character, Ap. 1.22(195). The Essenes were only farmers, Ant. 18.1:5(19). In another passage, however, some Essenes are reported as being skilled in other arts, evidently not farming, War 2.8:5(129).

We read also of a request from King Antiochus to Zeuxis his father, to give Jewish families who were to be moved out of Mesopotamia and Babylon to another country "a place for building their houses and a portion of land for their husbandry, and for the plantation of their vines". They were farmer colonists settled in Lydia and Phrygia to maintain peace among the inhabitants, Ant. 12.3:4(148f).

Josephus reports the inhabitants of Gischala as being chiefly devoted to agriculture. In the distress under Caius, who attempted

---

7. The term Judea is generally used to denote Palestine, e.g. Ant. 18.1:1(2); 14.4:4(74); 14.6:1(92); et al. - but in War 3.3:5(51f) Josephus seems to limit the term to the province Judea for he says, "And thus have I, with all possible brevity, described the country of Judea, and those that lie round about it", War 3.3:5(58), that is, the Galilees, Perea, and Samaria. If our observation is correct, Ptolemais, then, was no part of the province Judea, but lay well north on the Galilean coast. Cf. War 2.10:2(188).

to force his statue upon the Jews for worship, thousands left off the cultivation of their farms and crowded to Petronius in Tiberias. The story leads us to think that the Jews living around Tiberias were chiefly farmers. Even the principal men among them were farmers, Ant. 18. 8. In several passages in the story there are only references to the cultivation of the soil, Ant. 18.8(272, 274, 283, 284). In several passages in the story there are also splendid descriptions of the different districts and places of Palestine, also supporting the fact that the people were chiefly occupied with farming, and all that pertains to it. Galilee is very fertile, attracting the efforts even of the less industrious. The soil yields readily and abundantly. Because of the soil's fertility numerous cities have sprung up all over the province, holding populations of fifteen thousand and over, War 3.3:2. Galilee produced large quantities of oil so that the province was able to export it. Josephus adds that it had the sole privilege of exporting oil, War 2.20:2(592).

Perea was less adapted to farming than the Galilees. As a province it was larger, but much of it was desert and broken. Galilee was better adapted for the "milder kinds of fruits". Nevertheless the soil of Perea, where tillable, is moist, and good for fruits of all kinds. On the level places in Perea trees of all sorts grow. The olive tree, the grape vine, and the palm tree are chiefly cultivated. The spots adaptable for cultivation are well watered by mountain streams and ever flowing springs, War 3.3:3.

Samaria, lying between Judea and Galilee, is as Judea, "made up of hills and valleys". It is very fertile, and has sufficient rain fall for agriculture. Trees bearing autumnal fruit both wild and domesticated grow there in abundance. Its chief water supply is rain

water. The pastures are excellent, one result of which is extensive dairying. The fertility of the soil and its abundant harvests are evident in that Samaria like Galilee is well populated, War 3.3:4.

In another passage we have a description of theplain of Jericho. In this plain extending along the Jordan are plantations of palm trees. There too one finds beautiful gardens thick set with trees, as well as date-trees of various sorts differing in taste and name, and the balsam, cypress, and trees bearing myrobalanum. Bee culture was also probably carried on, since specific mention of honey is frequently made. The wonderful fertility of the plain is due to its remarkable climate and abundant water supply. It was one of Palestine's garden spots. Elsewhere Josephus speaks of the country around Jericho as the most fertile of Judea bearing palm-trees and the balsam, the latter of which are tapped for their sap, War 1.6:6(138); 1.18:5(361); Ant. 15. 4:2(96).

We read that Jotapata had an abundance of grain and all other necessaries for the siege except salt and water, War 3.7:12(181). The country surrounding Gennesareth produces all sorts of plants. Trees such as the walnut, palm, fig, and olive grow there in abundance. The climate is varied, Josephus speaking of it as "a happy contention of the seasons". Autumnal fruit grows there. Fruit is in season during ten months of the year including grapes and figs, War 3.107. We read that from Gadara came a large number of asses, sheep, camels, and oxen, when Placidus made an attack upon the country, were taken, War 4.7:5(436). The fortress Masada, near Jerusalem, stored vast quantities of fruit, War 4.7:2(404). It is also told how Titus cut down the fruit trees and hedges and walls aroung the groves and gardens

near Jerusalem, War 5.3:2(107). The people were enjoined to "pay the tithe of their annual fruits of the earth" to the Levites and the priests, Ant. 4.4:3(68); 20.8:8; 9:2. The entire ceremonial and sacrificial code of the Jews points to the fact that it was formulated for an agricultural people.

In describing Judea and surrounding provinces Josephus says he did so "with all possible brevity", War 3.3:5(58). He describes principally, if not exclusively, farming conditions in these provinces, supporting his explicit statement in Apion 1.12. Whether all the details of the somewhat miscellaneous references above to agricultural conditions are correct or not, they point to the fact that agriculture was regarded by Josephus as the chief occupation of Palestinian Jews.

7. Business and Industry.

It is related that in peaceful times the Jews apply themselves to their "mechanical occupations" or to the"tillage of the ground", Ap. 2.41(294); Cf. 2.39(283). This clearly states that some Jews were artisans, and that business and industry were a part of the economic life in Palestine.

Fishing was an industry in Galilee. We are not told in so many words, yet it is a fair inference from the author's description of Lake Gennesareth, War 3.10:7(506-7). The lake is forty furlongs wide, and one hundred and forty long. Several kinds of fish are found in it differing in taste and shape from those found elsewhere. It produces perch such as are found in a lake near Alexandria. A clearer passage is War 3.3:5(53). Our author's language clearly means that fishing was not a pastime, but a regular occupation. In its (Judea's) several "maritime places" yields of sea "delights" were secured.

The building operations carried on extensively during Herod's reign indicate that some Jews were mechanics. The rebuilding of the Temple was, no doubt, performed largely by Jews. We read that ten thousand of the most skilled artisans were chosen for the work. Some of the priests "were taught the arts of stone-cutters and others, of carpenters", Ant. 15.11:2(390). The report is that the Temple itself was erected by priests in a year and six months. Under Agrippa eighteen thousand workmen employed in the building of the Temple, upon its completion, were given the work of paving Jerusalem's streets. There is also mention of the walls built by the Jews around the newer part of Jerusalem (Bezetha, War 2.19:4), to the north of the Temple and over against the Antonian tower, after they had been begun by Agrippa, War 5.4:2(154). The building of the Temple at Leontopolis also in-

dicates that some Jews were skilled mechanics, War 7.10:3; cf. War 3. 10:6(505).

When Simon son of Gioras was besieged in Jerusalem, he, with his most faithful friends and some stone-cutters, attempted to escape by mining their way through and out of one of the subterranean passages under the city, War 7.2:1(26). Also during the siege John of Gischala used timbers from Lebanon and purposed for use upon the Temple, and therefore regarded as sacred, to build machines of war and towers of defense, War 5.1:5(36-7). We also read of a timber market in Jerusalem, War 2.19:4(530).

The most incidental reference to the making od clothing perhaps not at all as an industry is found in Ant. 15.9:2(310). Herod is commended for supplying clothing to the people of Judea and Syria during a famine. The statement reads that there was a great scarcity of garments because of the small number of sheep and goats, so that the people "had no wool to make use of, nor anything else to cover themselves". We read of a Jewish mother of the city Neerda in Babylon having her sons taught the trade of weaving sails, since it was not a disgrace among the Jewish men to be "weavers of cloth". It seemed to be a business, since they were employed to do this work, Ant. 18.9:1(314). WE are also told of a certain Jonathan of Cyrene, a weaver by trade, becoming seditious; War 7.11:1(438).

In a decree from Pergamus there is official report of a previous decree from the Roman senate commanding Antiochus, the king, to restore to the Jews the fortresses, harbors and country taken from them. It was decreed to be lawful for the Jews "to export their goods out of their own harbors." They were also permitted to exact customs from those using their harbors for exporting goods, Ant. 14.10:22.

In the author's description of Lake Asphaltitis he mentions laborers belonging to the lake whose business it is to gather the bituminous product found on the lake's surface into ships. This bitumen is used for manyypurposes among them, the caulking of ships etc. The words "the laborers that belong to the lake" may suggest that the gathering of this bituminous product was their daily occupation, War 4.8:4(480f).

Josephus reports that near Ptolemais a "maritime city of Galilee" sand of which glass is made, is found, War 2.10:2(190)1 Near Baaras there are mines of sulphur and alum, War 7.6:3(189). In Cyrene there are four classes: "citizens, husbandmen, strangers, and Jews", Ant. 14.7:2(115f). The Galileans exported oil,[8] War 2.21:2(592).

Finally there is reference to uncoined money and uncoined silver, Life 57(296). The phrases "uncoined money" and "uncoined silver" refer to the same thing suggesting the silver as purposed for the making of coins. We read of Herod I converting the ornaments of Antigonus' party into money. "Money" here evidently does not refer to the ornaments as of so much money value, but rather that the ornaments were made into coins, War 1.18:4(358).

All the references above are incidental, scattered and certainly varied. There is some exaggeration in numbers of men in connection with building operations in Jerusalem. The references gove us no specifically detailed description of any industry, as such, but yet permit us to conclude that Palestine's economic life was not solely agricultural, but also included certain trades and industries.

---

8. Traill, The Jewish War of Fl. Jos., p.CXXXVIII: "Oil - an article indispensable in the East, was not less so among the Jews than among their neighbors. It formed an article of diet; it was peculiarly necessary, or thought to be so, for lubricating and cleansing the skin; and mingled with wine, it was the principal means of effecting the cure of wounds. It constituted, also, a part of the offerings of the Jewish worship; and was moreover the symbolic element, employed in conveying sacerdotal and civil dignities".

8. Family Customs and Conditions.

The law is quoted as saying that "a woman is inferior to her husband in all things", Ap. 2.24(200).[9] The statement is concise and historically correct. It is found in the principal passage in Apion dealing with marriage. It expresses the status of the woman, including wife and daughter, in the home. It does not exclude certain rights granted to woman, although no specific rights are mentioned, but it is only a part of the general first century estimate of womankind and womanhood, Ap. 2.27(206). The Essene position is an extreme estimate of woman's place in social relationships, particularly in that of marriage. One order of Essenes does not marry, regarding the behavior of woman as "lascivious", and persuaded that none remains faithful to the marriage vow, War 2.8:2(120-1); 4.9:10(562). Other Essenes do marry, but only for the propagation of the human race. Wives were regarded as quarrelsome, Ant. 18.1:5(21).

Elsewhere the status of woman is reflected. Their higher education was neglected. The pupils of the great teachers, Matthias, Judas, Pollio, and Sameas were young men, Chap. 4. sec. 2. Young women are not mentioned. Woman's place and right in the socialorder is further reflected in the fact that the testimony of women was not accepted in civil courts, because of the levity and boldness of their sex, Ant. 4.8:15(219).

The home however, was a firmly organized social unit. The laws against social sins disrupting the home were stringent, although divorce was certainly not unknown, Ap. 2.24,30; Ant. 4.8:23(253).

---

9. Margolicuth renders it: "for says he", and Shiletto: "the legislator saith"m, but both are unnecessary. The word is simply "φησιν" and if Josephus had supplied the subject it would undoubtedly have been "ὁ νόμος", because in section 199, beginning, (and 200) Ap. 2.24, "ὁ νομος" is found, and it is understood throughout sections 199 and 200.

There is recurrent evidence that often the wives and children were punished for the crimes of, and with the husbands and parents, Ant. 15.8:4(290). The life of the children and wives was intimately involved in that of the husbands and fathers, War 7.9:1(395); 1.4:6(97); 1.16:4(312); Ant. 20.4:2(89); Life 42(207). The sanctity of the home circle was legally protected. Betrothal was a relationship equally protected with the marriage relation, Ap. 2.24(201). Due regard for social customs was enjoined, Ap. 2.24(200); cf. Ant. 18.9:5(345, 349). A man was not allowed "to take a woman by violence or deceit", but must demand her from the father, who had the power to give her away.

There is no explicit injunction against polygamy, but monogamy is clearly assumed as the custom. It seems that kings generally practiced polygamy, and sometimes for political reasons, Ant. 20.4:2(85, 89); 17.1:3(19); War 1.24:2(477); cf. Mish. Sanh. 2.4. But the priesthood and the people were singularly free from it; for the priests there were probably ceremonial and ritualistic reasons; for the people the reasons were perhaps economic; for both, to some extent, the reasons were ethical. Josephus regularly uses the singular "wife" when speaking explicitly about relations of husband and wife, Ap. 2.24. Although he says, "it being of old permitted to the Jews to marry many wives", the statement must be accepted with qualifications. The context is a reference to Herod's wives and not to the wives of Jews in general. If he has Dt. 17:17, "a king shall not multiply wives to himself", or Dt. 21:15, "If a man have two wives", in mind, the words of Josephus are carelessly tolerant.

---

10. Jebamoth IV:11 and Kethuboth X:1-6 allowed four wives to a private man, and Kerithoth III:7 allowed five. Compare with these also Sanh. II:4 and Justin Martyr's Trypho, Chap. 134.

There are those who from the passage Ant. 3.12;2(277) dealing with the marriage laws for high-priests urge that the author enjoined monogamy upon the high-priests.[11] The words in question are "καὶ ταύτην φυλάττειν" rendered in Margoliouth and Shilatto "and to retain her". Others would render the words "φυλάττειν" "φυλίττην", making the passage to agree with Philo's teaching in De Monarchia 2.11, namely, that a high-priest should choose a wife only from the priestly families. Grunbaum says, and probably correctly: "the words mean that the high-priest especially should guard his wife in order to keep his family lineage unsullied."[12] This statement accords with Apion 1.7 and Ant. 3.12:2(277f), where reference is made to the marriage of the priesthood. The words in question may indirectly favor monogamy, but they do not enjoin it.

Granting of divorce was the right of the husband only. Salome sent Costobarus a bill of divorce contrary to Jewish laws, Ant. 15.7:10(259). Likewise the divorce given by Herodias to her husband was a "confounding of Jewish laws", Ant. 18.5:4(136); cf. 1.20:7(147).[13] A husband could divorce a wife "for any causes whatsoever, (and many such causes happen among men"),[14] Ap. 4.8:23.[15] The wife was given a writ of divorce stating "that he will never use her as his wife any more". Josephus, a priest, divorced a captive, whom he married, cf. Ant. 3.12;2(276), he says at the command of Vespasian, stating no

---

11. See: Grünbaum, Die Priestergesetze bei Fl. Jos., 0.29, ft. note 2 for his comment on Zipser's rendering of the words "ἐξ ὁμοεθνοῦς γυναικός" Ap. 1.7, as "nur ein Weib und aus demselben Volke". Grunbaum finds in the words no injunction against polygamy.

12. P. Grunbaum, Die Priester Gesetze, u.s.w. p.30.

13. D. W. Amram, The Jewish Law of Divorce p.61, "The Roman law at the time of Herod allowed women to divorce their husbands and it was under this influence that the divorces were given by the women of Herod's family". See also ft.note 4, p.61, and Mk. 10:12.

reason for the divorce, but that it was done "upon my being freed from my bonds, and my going to Alexandria", Life 75(415). Another he divorce because he was "not pleased with her behavior", although she had become the mother of three of his children, Life 76(426), Life 76(426).

The ordinary Jewish home had few if any servants. The simplicity[15] of life among the Jews of Palestine, and the unwarlike character of the people suggests few servants and fewer slaves. Josephus says the Lacedemonians "neither ploughed their land nor exercised any trades", using others as servants for all the necessaries of life, and they had their food prepared for them by others, Ap. 2.32(229-30); 2.32(234), but the Jews worked with their own hands, Ap. 2:32(234). The Essenes kept no servants, thinking they tempted men to be unjust, Ant. 18.1:5(21).

Still we find mention in several places of servants. Women and servants have a knowledge of the law, Ap. 2.19(181); the mother of Josephus had maid-servants, War 5.13:3(545). Josephus had a number of servants, Life 44(223). Not much is said of slaves and slavery. Priests were forbidden to marry slaves, Ant. 3.12:2(276). A law for the protection of slaves is mentioned, Ap. 2.30(215). We read also: "our law justly ordains that slaves which run away from their masters

---

14. P. Grünbaum, Die Priestergesetze bei Fl. Jos. Ft. note, p.21; H. Bloch, Quellen der Fl. Jos., p.46; L. Blau, Die Judische Ehescheidung, p.43; E. Stapfer, Palestine in the Time of Christ, p.153; D. W. Amram, The Jewish Law of Divorce, p.34, state that Josephus is clearly on the side of Hillel on the divorce question, allowing divorce for any reason.

15. Josephus makes free use of words denoting servitude, implying thereby seemingly no distinction between servant and slave, e.g. "θεραπόντων", Ant. 12.3:4(152), "δούλων", Ant. 18.1:5(21), "οἰκέτας" War 3.8:5(373), "παιδὶ", Life 44(223), and "οἰκείων", Life 18(94).

shall be punished, though the masters they run away from may have been wicked masters to them", War 3.8:5(373). The passages assume some slaves among the Jews, who were the property of their owners, but still protected to some extent, and enjoying certain privileges due to the religious customs of the Jews, e.g. rest for all on the Sabbath.[16]

In regard to the social status of woman in first century Judaism, Josephus reflects chiefly one side. He demands entire obedience from the wife with some compensating obligations due her from the husband; but his presentation id definitely based upon the idea of woman's inferiority "in all things". His presentation has a legalistic color. There is a hard metallic ring about it that is foreign to a social relationship such as the married state, even if it only approximates the ideal.

---

16. J. G. Müller, Fl. Jos. gegen Apion; "Das Gesetz raumte den Sklaven manche Begunstigung ein, die sonst im Alterthum nicht vorkam, Sabbatsruhe, Verbot leiblicher Beschadigung u. dzl."

CHAP. IV. THE INTELLECTUAL LIFE AND ACHIEVEMENT OF JUDAISM.

1. Jewish Literature of the First Century A. D.

If we understand the words "Jewish literature of the first century" to denote literature written in the first century and in Hebrew of Aramic, we are confined to exceedingly narrow limits so far as discussion of Josephus' mention of such literature is concerned.

He speaks of having written his War "in the language of our country". This work is not extant and cannot be traced through Aramaisms in the Greek History of the War.[1] The Greek edition cannot be regarded as a mere translation of the Aramaic, but is probably a revision. Was the Greek War a mere reproduction of the Aramaic we might expect to trace considerable influence of this Aramaic source, in content, style, and terminology.

In Apion 1.6(28-29) Josephus states a proposition which for him and his readers needs no proof. It is that the "Phoenicians especially made use of letters, both for the common affairs of life, and for delivering down the history of common transactions". The statement continues, that the Jews' high-priests and prophets were selected for a similar task, of writing the annals of their people. The words "all along down to our own times" mean that Josephus is not referring here specifically to the Old Testament, since he regarded the history in the Old Testament as ending with Artaxerxes. Nor do

1. Weber, Josephus and Vespasian, p.15f, considers the opinion of Schürer, Niese and Hölscher concerning the relation of the Greek War to the Aramaic War (see ftnote 2, p.15). His own view is that both the Greek and the Aramaic history of the War were written at the same time with the help of "συντρόφοις" Ap. 1.9(50); but the Aramaic was the first to be published, "πρότερον", War Pref. 1.3, and not much earlier than the Greek. Weber's statement has a considerable show of proof. However, it is a question whether the aorist tense of the verbs μεταβαλών, συντάξας and ἀνέπεμψα support his statements.

we understand these annals, if such theyawere, to be the genealogies of the priests, nor the constantly growing list of high-priests. The respective characters of the annals and the genealogies are strikingly different. In the annals we have a record of the "common affairs of life"; in the genealogies we have a record of the priestly families. The description of the annals implies a larger scope of events than one should expect in the genealogies. We may to assume that there was some literary activity among the priests, the products of which were not canonized, nor included among extant apocryphal and pseudepigraphical writings of Palestine; and that this literary activity extended into the first century A. D.

Old Testament criticism is generally agreed that back of the canonical history of Israel lie written sources.[2] Josephus also distinctly says that the Jews had always been, and were in his time careful in writing records of events in their national life. The question now is not the degree of historical care exercised, but simply whether annals were actually written by those appointed. To our author, history writing did not cease with the last of the "succession of prophets". The fact that the literature following upon the canonical Old Testament was not equally valued with it, is not evi-

---

2. E. G. see S. R. Driver's Literature of the Old Testament, p.186f.

3. C. Wildeboer, The Origin of the Canon of the Old Testament, p.46, says: "My impression is that Josephus' view, along with much that is untenable, e.g. about the "succession of prophets", contains important elements of historic truth. These elements are (1) that the line between canonical and uncanonical coincides, in the thought of Josephus and the circle of which he is the representative, with the cessation of prophecy; and (2) that a general settled persuasion in regard to canonicity precedes the decision of the schools".
Ap. 1.8(42) reflects this "general settled persuasion", e.g. no change made for a long time, and the willingness to die for the twenty-two books.

dence that writing ceased with the Old Testament, but that the influence of legalism among the people was tending toward fixing the canon. With the increased emphasis of legalism upon preserving its sacred scriptures, all subsequent historical writings fell into relative disuse, and in the course of time many disappeared.

The passage Ap. 1.8(41) also indicates that instructed by their teachers, the people had developed a considerable canonical consciousness, so to speak. To make their discrimination the apocryphal books must have been available in Palestine, and also studied comparatively with the Old Testament of the Hebrew canon.[4] The apocryphal books in the Septuagint, but not in the Hebrew canon were esteemed, but not as Scripture; only books in the latter, Josephus implies, were regarded as "books of our own nation", Ap. 1.8(42). That the apocryphal books are referred to in Ap. 1.8 is all but certain, though they are not so designated. The statement simply is "our history written since Artaxerxes."

In at least three passages there is reference to the records of priestly families, Life 1(1); Ap. 1.7; Ant. 20.10. It is difficult to determine to what extent these have been elaborated by Josephus. We perhaps approximate the original form of such records in Life 1. (3-6). The author begins: "I will accordingly set down my progenitors in order"; and closes: "Thus have I set down the genealogy of my family as I have found it described in the public records". The names of the witnesses are missing in this passage. The contents of such records are more minutely given in Ap. 1.7. They contained the slightest biographical elaboration with occasionally an incidental identifying reference; but usually gave simply thenames of the family and attest-

4. J. G. Müller, Fl. Jos. gegen Apion, p.102, says: "Man kann diese Trennung nicht mit Eichhorn und Bleek fur eine Privatansicht Josephs halten".

ing witnesses. After periods of war the records were revised by the surviving priests. These records were a part of the nation's archives. They were made not only in Judea, but wherever Jewish priests lived, e.g. in Egypt and Babylon. The records were all sent to Jerusalem.

If we include literary productions written in Greek during the first century A. D. by Jews, we may speak of the sixty-two letters of Agrippa II to Josephus, two of which our author inserted into his autobiography, Life 65(364).[4a] The theme of the collection of letters was the Greek revision of the War. They were written in the course of and after the completion of its composition. That they were written in Greek is a fair inference for three reasons: first, they dealt with Josephus' Greek revision of the War; second, Agrippa was a thoroughly Hellenized Jew, versed in Greek literature, Life 65(359); and thirdly, since two letters in the Life are Greek in form, the probability is that they all were.[5]

There is a single reference to Philo found in the Antiquities, Ant. 18.8:1(259). He is described as the principal member of the Jewish embassy to Caius, a very eminent man in every respect, and "one not unskilful in philosophy." The passage does not definitely indicate acquaintance with the works of Philo. All it states, so far as reference to Philo's literary work is concerned, is that he was an eminent Jewish philosopher in Alexandria. Evidence that Josephus knew Philo's works must be deduced from a similarity of passages in the writings of both, that is, from a probable borrowing of Josephus from Philo.[6]

4a. H. Bloch, p153-4, regards these letters as genuine, since he ascribes a large part of Ant. 18-20 to the information which Josephus received from Agrippa II.

5. "βασιλεὺς Ἀγρίππας Ἰωσήπῳ τῷ φιλτάτῳ χαίρειν"

Justus may be included among the other writers upon the Jewish War, if we accept the statement of Josephus, Life 65(336,365). In Apion there is reference to those who had written upon the War from hearsay and not as having been eye-witnesses, or acquainted with the country Palestine, Ap. 1.8(46). But this could not be said of Justus. He took an active part in the war, and was evidently a Jew. The size of his history cannot be determined from any reference of Josephus. It may have been of the entire war, since we find him early in the war in Galilee, Life 9(32f), and he published his history after the death of Vespasian and Agrippa, Life 65(360). There is also the supposition that Justus wrote upon the siege of Jerusalem. We can be certain that Justus wrote a history of the great revolt. Josephus deals chiefly with Justus' account after the affairs in Galilee.

There are three references to the books of the Essenes in War 2.8, see 2.8; 6(136); 7(1420, 12(159). But these statements do not indicate any literary activity of this sect. They refer to "the writings of the ancients", "the holy books belonging to their sect", and "holy books." All were written perhaps long before the first c century A. D.

Josephus says that the Jews consider learning to consist in a full acquaintance with the law and ability to interpret the meaning of the sacred writings. This is acquired only by a few, Ant. 20.11; 2(264f). The Jews answered Petronius when they protested against the enforced worship of Caius' statue, that "by the labours of our ancestors" they had not transgressed the law, Ant. 18.8;2(266).

6. H. Bloch, Quellen des Fl. Jos., p. 117-140, traces no direct borrowing of Josephus from Philo, but where similarities exist between them, a similar source is probable for both. Niese, art. Josephus, in the Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, VII p.575, says: "Philo, the Younger, was likewise not unknown to Josephus, who, however, does not quote from him, but merely mentions him as the spokesman of the Jewish deputation to the Emperor Caius."

The "labours" evidently refer to the fence around the Torah, Abot 1.1. Elsewhere the many observances "by succession" from the fathers are "derived from the tradition of our fore-fathers", Ant. 13.10:6(297). We cannot determine from such statements how much legal, expository, wisdom or apocalyptic writing was done upon the Hebrew scriptures.

We read that a soldier once "seized the laws of Moses that lay in one of those villages,"" Ant. 20.5:4(115); in the parallel account in War 2.12:2(229) it is "the sacred book of the law". When persecuted at Caesarea "the Jews caught up their books of the law", War 2.14:5(291). The context suggests that the books were taken out of the synagogue. They were probably the scrolls used in synagogue worship. The same may be said of Ant. 20.5:4(115). The passages above in the light of Ap. 1.8(38f); 2.17(175); 2.20(187); Ant. 20.11:2(264-5); War 2.17:4(417); and passages indicating the people's dependence upon their leaders, e.g. Ant. 13.10:6(297f); 18.1:3(15), indicate that scrolls of the law were not numerous, and that they were usually in the synagogues. There is one exception in which the "holy books" are not found only in the synagogue, Ant. 16.6:2(164).[7] We cannot, however, assume from this single passage that the Jews possessed libraries to which many of the people, if able to read the sacred books in Hebrew, had access. Our impression is that the people were satisfied to receive their knowledge from their religious leaders.

With the canonical books, Esther, Daniel, and the book I Esdras, Josephus also used the book of Aristeas for the Persian period, Ant. 12.2. Although of Alexandrian origin, it quite probably was current

---

7. Margoliouth wrongly renders "ἀνδρῶνος", in Ant. 16.6:2(164) public school; Shilleto gives it correctly, "men's apartments".

in Palestine. The story would find acceptance among Palestinian Judaism, due to the place given in it to the elders (translators of the LXX) from Palestine.

The Greek history of Justus of Tiberias; other writers on the Jewish war probably in Palestine, cf. Life 65(365); War Pref. 1(2); Ap. 18(46); the fact that Agrippa II and his family were acquainted with Greek literature, Ap. 1.9(51), cf. Life 65(359); the literary work of Nicolaus in Herod's court, Ant. 1.3:6(94); 1.3:9(108), et al.; the mention of Herod's commentaries which Bloch[8] thinks are distinct from Nicolaus' works, Ant. 15.6:3(174); the reference to four books of Alexander, son of Mariamne, War 1.25:1f, point in the direction of some literary activity most probably in Greek among the upper class and royalty in Palestine. We cannot assume here any extensive knowledge of such works among the common people.

The teaching of II Baruch and IV Ezra being essentially apocalyptic is not within the realm of Josephus' main interest. Nor can we imagine that books of this type had any wide circulation in Josephus' surroundings after 70 A. D. Again, the particular books mentioned above took shape late in the first century, and in all probability in Palestine; and after 70 A. D. Josephus was in Rome.

From the passages Ant. 20.9:1; 18.3:3 we may infer that he had some acquaintance of early Christianity. It is difficult to determine how much of Ant. 18.3:3 is editorial. That the passage is out of context argues little against its non-genuineness, cf. Ant. 13.5:9 in its context. The attitude of Josephus toward Jewish eschatology and the fact that earliest Christianity was predominantly eschatological are reasons for regarding Ant. 18.3:3 almost entirely as an in-

---

8. Bloch, Die Quellen des Fl. Jos., p.140f.

terpolation. The slight reference to Christianity in Josephus is almost equal to the dissent of total silence upon Christianity by first century writers. Then too it was a movement chiefly among the lower classes; among them its literature was found. As a historian Josephus mentions Christianity. Had he admired it, he would have said much more about it, cf. his description od the Essenes. We cannot add anything to the criticism of Ant. 18.3:3; but the Josephus we have studied never wrote about the historical Jesus, "He was (the) Christ". For Josephus that would have meant conversion to Christianity.

The data in Josephus point clearly to some literary activity among the Jews in Palestine. Josephus' indefinite allusion to Philo would lead us to think that Palestinian Judaism was not widely aware of the Jewish literary activity of Alexandria. The statement of Josephus which best sets forth the scantiness of contemporary literature among his people is found in Ap. 1.8(38). The context has specific reference to the Hebrew canon, but the statement is nevertheless applicable as an estimate of Jewish literary production and the Jewish attitude toward literature as compared with the production and attitude of Greek and Roman writers.

Josephus also mentions Pollio, the Pharisee, and Sameas his disciple, as teachers of the law, Ant. 15.1:1(3). The two are viewed as "zugoth" according to Jewish custom, for we read: "Pollio, the Pharisee, and Sameas, and the greatest part of their scholars, Ant. 15.10:4(370). Sameas is previously mentioned as a man noted for his righteousness. For this reason Herod I spared his life, says Josephus, Ant. 14.9:4(172f). Since Sameas exercised a large influence over the people, it was in accordance with the king's shrewd policy to spare and even to honor this great teacher. The tradition is inexact in Ant. 14.9:4(172f) Sameas predicts Herod's revenge upon the Sanhedrin; but in Ant. 15.1:1(4) Pollio is said to have made the prediction.

These two prominent teachers of the law, one a Pharisee, opposing the civil authorities by refusing to take an oath of fidelity to king Herod I, are here set before us. "The greatest part of their scholars "followed their example. These teachers were also highly esteemed at least by the people of Jerusalem, for it was upon their advice that they allowed Herod I to enter the city. Herod was cautious enough not to oppose this school in Jerusalem. The accounts say that it was because of the "reverence he bore to Pollio and Sameas. The influence of these "zugoth" must have been tremendous, Ant. 15.10:4(370).

The author also mentions Simon the son of Gamaliel as being of a very noble family of the Pharisees, who are superior to others in their learning and knowledge of the laws. Simon is not referred to as a teacher, but as one of great wisdom and foresight who was eminently capable of maintaining or restoring order. He had a place in the Sanhedrin, Life 38(191).

In connection with the reference to Simon, Josephus speaks of an embassy to the Galileans, men distinguished because of their families and learning. Of the four mentioned, three were Pharisees. The fourth, Simon, was perhaps not a Pharisee, since the other three are expressly so designated. All were "versed in their law, "and two were priests. One of the Pharisees was a priest, Life 39(196f).

If we accept Josephus' statement that after three years under Banus he joined the Pharisees, we have in him then a professed priest and Pharisee, not a professional teacher, but a scholar well versed in the Jewish law, Life 2(10f). We believe this to be almost the unanimous opinion among writers upon the life and works of our author, and it is his own claim also,[9] Ap. 1.10(54); War 2.17:4(417). We recognize considerable conceit in the account of his life; but he was of aristocratic, priestly lineage, and was a learned man. Born and brought up in Jerusalem, he had every opportunity in Judaism to devote himself to study and the pursuit of learning.

Six of these individuals named by Josephus were noted for their skill in the law, and probably all were Pharisees except Simon of the embassy. Two of those mentioned were priests, and at least four were professional teachers. Josephus also refers to the Pharisees as a group noted for their knowledge of Jewish laws and customs. The Pharisees, not the Sadducees before Hyrcanus I had been formulating the unwritten code, Ant. 13.10:5,6. Since the Sadducees rejected this, the plain inference is that the Pharisees were chiefly responsible for the oral tradition. They represented the intelligence and learning of the people. Josephus speaks of them as "philosophers" that is

9. See P. Grünbaum, Die Priestergesetze, p.13, and H. Bloch, Die Quelle, p.52 ft. note for Josephus' knowledge of written and oral tradition. See also Bentwich, Josephus, p.259, for a fair estimate of Josephus' works.

men who gave themselves chiefly to learning, especially the interpretation and development of the law. As a result a certain intellectual pride had developed among them. Because of their exact knowledge of tradition, they regarded themselves as especially favored by God, Ant. 17.2:4(41). They had acquired a reputation among the Jews as their learned men, Ant. 18.1:3(15).

We may also posit a high degree of interpretative skill among the Sadducees, but not for the purpose of becoming the teachers of the people. They ventured to oppose the Pharisees, and the sharpest disputes arose between them, Ant. 13.10:6. They had the hardihood to dispute with the Pharisaic teachers regarding the place of the oral tradition in relation to the written law, Ant. 18.1:4. Josephus says: "for a great while the Jews had three sects of philosophy peculiar to themselves", Ant. 18.1:2(11). As far back as the time of Hyrcanus I (135-105 B. C.) the contest between the two leading "sects" representing two tendencies or interests among the Jews, had begun. In the struggle the Sadducees for a long time had kept pace with the Pharisees; for even in the days of Josephus the questions arising between them had not been settled. This assumes a degree of knowledge of the Torah among the Sadducees, if not equal to the Pharisaic, at least considerable enough to command the attention of the learned Pharisees during all the years of the struggle. But we read nowhere in Josephus of a Sadducee as a professional teacher.

In the embassy to the Galileans there were two priests, Life 39. Josephus tells us that he also was a priest, Life 1; War 3.8:3 (352); Ap. 1.10(54). In Ap. 1.10(54f) he lays claim to high qualifications to write the Antiquities, because he is a priest by birth, and as such made a thorough study of the sacred books which he used

as source material. Moreover, as a priest, he studied the teaching (τῆς φιλοσοφίας) of the sacred books. The writing of the Antiquities proceeded from an accurate knowledge of the people's history, Ap. 1.10.

Also in War 3.8:3(352) he tells us he was enabled to predict Vespasian's good fortune because as a priest, and of the "posterity of priests" he was acquainted with the Old Testament prophets. This is possibly a touch of intellectual pride in the words "such a mere rustic was he" when describing the usurping high-priest chosen by the Zealots, War 4.3:8(155). We read also of "priests that were skilful in the customs of their country". They were commoned by the rulers to calm the seditious multitudes by informing them that receiving sacrifices from foreign nations was a long-standing custom handed down from their forefathers, War 2.17:4(417f). The duties of the priest listed in Ap. 2.21(187); 2.23(194) demanded a thorough knowledge of all Jewish law. Their qualifications were not wealth or any other good fortune, but learning and strength of character. The law was entrusted to them together with its due enforcement. For Josephus, Israel was truly a kingdom of priests, Ant. 14.3:2(41).

"Scribes" is not a favorite word with Josephus to designate those skilled in the law. In War 6.5:3(291) there is mention of sacred scribes interpreting the signs preceding the fall of Jerusalem. The phrases "men of learning" and "wise men" in the same passage probably have reference to the scribes. In Ant. 20.9:3(208) Eleazar, a scribe is mentioned. But here the word "scribe" is similar to our modern term "secretary". Eleazar was the scribe of the governor of the Temple. In Ant. 10.4:1(55) Shaphan, the scribe, is one of the "curators" of the Temple. We read of scribes of the Temple together with the Sanhedrin, priests, and the sacred singers exempted from

poll-money, the crown tax and other taxes, Ant. 12.3:3(142). Nothing in all these passages is said of their function as teachers.

Among the Jews there were also men who taught independently. We have an example in Banus the ascetic, to whom Josephus resorted, and with whom he lived between his sixteenth and nineteenth years. That Banus was an Essene is not probable.[10] There were ascetics among the Jews of the first century not Essenes. John the Baptist from priestly parentage preached in the wilderness, but there is very little about his record to remind us of War 2.8. Besides, from Josephus' accounts we are not certain that the Essenes lived exclusively in desert places. In fact, his accounts would place some of them in segregated colonies in the cities. Also if Banus was an Essene, we must assume that he, an Essene taught Josephus the principles of belief and practice of the Pharisees and Sadducees also, for the account reads: "when I had accomplished my desires (presumably, that of becoming acquainted with the sects) I returned back to the city". That he received instruction under Banus is not definitely stated, but the entire context makes it highly probable. Banus, then was probably a priest, who for some reason lived secluded life. Priests were found in many places in Palestine and elsewhere, Ap. 1.7(33). It must not be assumed that all lived in Jerusalem. Some were poor, Ant. 20.8:8 (181); 9:2(207). Banus was one, who in the judgment of our author could render assistance to him in acquiring a knowledge of the three sects. As a priest who "preserved his purity", he probably influenced Josephus to become a Pharisee.

---

10. I. Traill, The Jewish Wars of Fl. Jos., p.CXXX: "Nor must this eremitic life be confounded with the far more artificial institution of the Essenes,-- a very ancient institution also, -- any more than with the fanatical monkery of a later age".

In Josephus the professional teachers and scholars are the Pharisees. Wellhausen says Josephus forgets to tell his readers th that scribes and Pharisees are alike, Ant. 13.10:6.[11] Josephus thinks of the priesthood as the embodiment of Jewish learning, an "ecclesiola in ecclesia", and thus also well qualified to rule, an "imperium in imperio",also, cf. Ezek. 44:27; Mal. 2:7.

---

11. Wellhausen'sstatement:"Die Pharisäer waren die Partei der Schriftgelehrten, und sie waren von Haus aus weiter nichts als das," is overdrawn. In Josephus they take a considerable part in political activities. See J. Wellhausen, Die Pharisäer und die Sadducaer, p.11.

3. Education in the Synagogue.

The synagogue was not only the place for worship, but also for the specific inculcation of the law. Josephus says that their legislator Moses made provisions for the people to leave off their other employments, and to assemble together to hear the law, and to learn it exactly, and this not once or twice, or often, but each week, Ap. 2.17(175). The words refer to the systematic reading of the Pentateuch, the general reading of other parts of the Old Testament and the expository instruction given each Sabbath by the synagogue teachers. The Sabbath and the synagogue were, no doubt, the best time and place for the moral and religious education of the people.

The Jews were enthusiastic of their national faith among Gentiles. Hence the decrees in Ant. 13.9; 14.8; 14.10; 16.6 point in that direction. Their proselyting was not always successful, Ap. 2. 10(123). The reaction of the Gentiles toward the Jews' aggressiveness was sometimes bitter opposition and persecution. We read that at Dora some seditious enemies provoked the anger of the Jews byy placing a statue of Caesar in their synagogue, Ant. 19.6:3. The young men who did this must have known enough about the Jewish attitude toward images and idolatry to realize that this deed would arouse their ange Also at Caesarea a certain seditionist sacrificed birds upon an earthen vessel at the entrance of the synagogue, War 2.14:5. The man was evidently not a Jew, yet he knew that the sacrificing of birds, thereby insinuating that the Jews of Caesarea were a leprous people, that is, social outcasts, would stir up trouble, cf. Ap. 1.26f. The question arises, how did this Gentile know about Leviticus 14 well enough thus to provoke the Jews? In the decree of Caesar Augustus there is

a stern prohibition against the stealing of the "holy books" (law) out of the synagogue or men's apartment, Ant. 16.6;3(164). We read elsewhere of one who, snatching up the law, tore it before the eyes of the Jews, War 2.12;2(229). In the uprising at Caesarea the Jews took their books of the law and fled to Narbata. In these references to the "holy books" there is evidence that the Jews' opponents knew how they treasured their sacred scrolls, and that their law was their life. It is clear from the Roman decrees, from the incidents at Dora, Caesarea and elsewhere, from the specific charges of their enemies, that the Jews were actually and constantly engaged in religious propaganda. No doubt much of this was done in and by means of the synagogue.

In some localities the Jews had great success in winning others to Judaism. In Damascus many women were proselytes, War 2.20;2(560); cf. 7.3;3(45). Josephus reports Strabo as saying that many nations imitate the Jews' way of living, Ant. 14.7;3(116). We find an Ananias, the tutor of the king Izates, carrying on his propaganda among the royal women, and winning them and the king Izates. His mother Helena also became a proselyte to Judaism through the instruction of another Jew. Fulvia, a "woman of great dignity" at Rome was a proselyte, Ant.18.3;5(82). There were the "οἰκούμενος", "throughout the habitable earth", says Josephus, Ant. 14.7;2(110). In Herod's palace the zealous Pharisees are "inveigling the women", Ant. 17.2;4(41). In exultation over the superiority of the Jewish law, our author writes: "we are become the teachers of other men, in the greatest number of things", Ap. 2.41(293).

We may safely regard the synagogue as the principal agency, directly or indirectly, for the maintenance and propagation of Ju-

daism in the outlying districts of Palestine and throughout the Greco-Roman world.

4. Education in the Home and School.

Josephus' theory of education is practical. Theoretic learning is not in view, Ap. 2.17(173). The purpose of learning is to develop faith and right conduct. His criticism of other systems of education is, namely, that either precept of practice is emphasized, one to the neglect of the other. The Lacedemonians and Cretians stress the latter and forget the former; the Athenians and almost all other Greeks stress the former to the neglect of the latter, Ap. 2. 16(172). The Lacedemonians devote all their time to acquiring martial skill, but are ignorant of the great laws of their legislator, Lycurgus. The result is defeat at the hands of their enemies, Ap. 2.31(229f). On the other hand, Plato although grave in conduct, forceful and persuasive in speech and teaching, is ridiculed by the practical man in political affairs, Ap. 2.31(223f). An elaborate code or philosophical system is a fine thing in itself, but yet worthless, if it can not be effective in the practical every day affairs of the people. The ultimate test of any education is its ability to control and to inspire the conduct of the community, and in a wider scope, the nation, cf. Ap. 2.41(292).

Now there are in Josephus' philosophy of education two methods, "two ways of coming at any sort of learning, and a moral conduct of life; the one is by instruction in words, the other by practical exercises", Ap. 2.16(171). These two methods were set forth by Moses. In this Moses is superior to all other legislators or philosophers, namely, uniting theory and practice, and that, with great care, Ap.

2.17(173). Conduct was stimulated by daily practice. Instruction and learning found their true counterparts in careful observance and loyal obedience.

The text-book of the Jews was the Torah, Ap. 2.17(175). We may in this term include the Old Testament plus the oral tradition of the elders. Josephus says of himself, that as a lad of fourteen he was so proficient in the knowledge of the law that high-priests and the principal men of Jerusalem came to him when they desired an interpretation of the intricate meaning of points in their law, Life 2(9); cf. Lk. 2:46-47. Allowing for considerable exaggeration, we may say that the passage indicates that the leading Jews gave much attention to the education of their children and youth in the Torah. The Jewish curriculum was limited to a single branch of study. In another exaggerated statement due to his apologetic attitude, Josephus says that the Jews can more readily speak about their laws than they can tell their own names, Ap. 2.18(178). Even the women and servants are adherents of the Jewish piety.

In childhood this education began first in the home and later it was continued in the schools. It was compulsory having been enjoined by Moses, Ap. 2.25(204). The mention of Moses, no doubt, has reference to Deut. 6:7&20f., and 11:19. The words "make them acquainted with the acts of their predecessors" permit us to assume that the oral tradition was also a part of the curriculum. If our observation here is correct, we may safely conclude that in such passages as Life 2(9) and Luke 2:46-47 there is a substantial basis of fact, and that this process of imprinting the Jewish law and faith upon the child's mind was necessarily begun early, Ap. 2.25(204). It was Judaism's principal care to educate her children well, Ap. 1.12(60). Eleazar in his

final speech to his soldiers supports this statement, when he says that God, the Jewish laws and their forefathers taught them "soon as ever they could use their reason" to be loyal patriots, War 7.8:7(343); Ant. 4.8:12.

The question arises, do we find any suggestion or statement as to the specific method employed in the home and school in imparting the knowledge of the law? Josephus says of himself that "he appeared to have both a good memory and understanding", Life 2(9). This would imply assimilative grasp of the contents of the text-book together with considerable memorizing. His power of memory was one reason for his proficiency. In Ant. 4.8:12(210) we read: "for it is a good thing that those laws should be engraven in their sould, and preserved in their memories". Elsewhere Josephus speaks of having the laws "as it were, engraven on our souls", Ap. 2.18(178). Then too he says Moses "imprinted faith in God so firmly on all posterity (Jews), that it was impossible to shake it," Ap. 2.16(169). When the impartation of the laws' contents became the education of the Jew, the rote system must have been principally used. It somewhat resembled the catechetical method still in use to impart the elements of Christian doctrine. The words "ἡμῶν δ' ὁντιοῦν εἴ τις ἐροιτο τοὺς νόμους, ῥᾴων ἂν εἴποι πάντας ἢ τοὔνομα τὸ ἑαυτοῦ.", also imply that the Jewish child had the laws fixed indelibly upon its memory, Ap. 2.18(178). The constant repetition in going over the same ground, yet memorizing anew day by day some additional material, inevitably produced on the average mind to a large extent the results suggested in the sentence above. The lessons were oral and recited by the teacher, and them repeated by the students. The manner in which the oral tradition was taught is suggested in Ant. 13.10:6(297), where it is stated that the

Pharisees had delivered observances "by succession"from the fathers to the people. One recalls Abot 1.1;4,7, in the words "by succession". The practical method was a part of the Jewish educational system, and consisted in faithful observance of the moral and ceremonial laws learned in the home and schools, Ap. 2.17(173) et al. Josephus is consistently faithful to his philosophy of education (Jewish), that theory and practice, precept and daily conduct are the essential elements in the best education.

We find some data that indicate private instruction of youths. We are told that Izates "sent his sons five in number, and they but young also, to learn accurately the language of our nation, together with our learning", et., Ant. 20.3;4(71). The lectures of Judas and Matthias were attended "every day", Ant. 17.6;2(149). But the reference is not to an elementary school, cf. War 1.33;2(649). Herod's sons were educated at Rome, War 1.31;1(602). There is a deprecatory allusion to "country school-masters", War 1.24;3(479). Josephus says elsewhere: "Let the children also learn the laws as the first thing they are taught, which will be the best thing they can be taught, and will be the cause of their future felicity", Ant. 4.8;12(211f). Josephus says of himself that when fourteen years of age he had received a considerable education, Life "(8-9). The tutors of others of Herod's sons seem to reside in the royal palace, Ant. 16.8;3(242f). One passage in Margolicuth's translation seems to suggest public schools among the Jews, Ant. 16.6;2(164); but Shilleto has the correct rendering for "ἀνδρῶνος", namely "men's apartments". It is singular that in passages where Josephus deals specifically with education of youths he does not mention an elementary school system. Yet from such passages we may infer that there was some education outside the home;

and in all probability in the synagogues. Had there been a well established elementary school system, would not Josephus for apologetic purposes have mentioned it to his Greek readers? He does speak of the synagogue as the place of instruction. The rabbinic tradition regarding an elaborate elementary school system cannot therefore be entirely accepted. The data given above chiefly indicate private education among the upper classes.

Jewish education produced certain definite results. One already mentioned was a minute knowledge of the law, Ap. 2.18(178). In the light of Ant. 20.11:2(265) the statement is exaggerated. We may assume that only the best scribes had this, and not the people in general. Another result was reverent loyalty to the law; and akin to this, an ingrained fear of its transgression, Ap. 2.18(178); a third result being "entire agreement" of thought and conduct. Among other peoples diversity of thought and conduct was prevalent. But among the Jews there were uniformity and acceptance of all notions concerning God and (the Jews) having no difference in the conduct of life and manners, this "entire agreement" procures the best harmony of character among mankind, Ap. 2.19(179). Here again, however, we must allow for the author's rhetorical apologetic.

6. Medical Knowledge and Practice.

Among the Palestinian Jews in the first century A. D. there was little scientific knowledge regarding the human body and diseases including their causes and treatments. Frequent mention is made of the physician; in one instance, quite incidentally a female physician (midwife), Life 37(185). We read of the wounded placed un under physicians' care, War 1.12:7(246); physicians attend king Herod I at Calirrhoe, War 1.33:5(657); Josephus is advised by his physicians to be removed to Tarichaae, Life 72(404). Nowhere in Josephus do we find a reference to the rite of circumcision being performed by the priest, although it was strictly a ceremonial and religious rite; but there is mention of a surgeon performing the operation, Ant. 20.2: 4(46). We read of physicians among the royalty skilful in the use of poisons, War 1.30:7(598).

Exorcism by certain means and devices was employed (cf. Tobit 6.2:8; 8.2:9; 11.7:15), since the sick were sometimes regarded as demon possessed.[12] In Ant. 8.2:5 we read that Solomon had skill to expel demons, "a science useful and sanative to men". Ailments were cured by the use of incantations.[13] Solomon could exorcise demons so that they would never return. Josephus inserts: "and this method of cure is of great force unto this day". He reports how he himself had seen a certain Eleazar cast out demons in the presence of Vespasian, his sons, his captains, and all the soldiers. Then he de-

---

12. A. Poznanski, Ueber die religions philosophischen Anschauungen u.s.w. p.17 Says: "Des Satans erwahnt Josephus nirgends"; see also Poznanski's ft.note, p.17, on Josephus' treatment of I Chron. 21:1; cf. Ant. 7.13:1(318f).

13. The words of L. Blau: "Josephus' Behauptung, die von ihm mit einem wirklich vorgekommenen Fall belegt wird, passt blos auf Jüdisch-christliche Kreise", find no support in Josephus. L. Blau, Das Altjüdische Zauberwesen, p.56. See e.g. Mt. 12:27; Lk. 11:19; Tobit passages above; Acts 19:13; Justin M. Tryphó XXXV.

scribes the cure. It was as follows: "he put a ring that had under the seal a root of one of those sorts mentioned by Solomon, to the nostrils of the demoniac, after which he drew out the demon through his nostrils; and when the man fell down immediately, he abjured him to return unto him no more, making still mention of Solomon, and reciting the incantations which he composed, Ant. 8.2:5(47). The narrative continues: "And when Eleazar would persuade and demonstrate to the spectators that he had such a power, he set a little way off a cup or basin full of water, and commanded the demon, as he went out of the man to overturn it, and thereby to let the spectators know that he had left the man", Ant. 8.2:5(48). Solomon's possession of this skill was evidence that "he was beloved of God".

We have another account of casting out demons, and that by means of a certain root called Baaras. This root is brought to sick persons, and by its application, it drives away the demons. This is the only value of the root. The root itself is very poisonous, of a color like that of fire; and in the evening "it sends out a ray like lightning", but it is very effective as a cure for the demon possessed, who otherwise would be killed by the demons, War 7.6:3.

Religion had a large place in the prevention and cure of sicknesses. Sacrifices had been appointed "for escaping distempers", Ant. 3.9:4(236). The purificatory sacrifices for various sexual uncleannesses have a bearing upon this subject; as also the prohibition against the use of blood for food, since the blood was thought to contain the soul and spitit, Ant. 3.11:2(260). No cure is mentioned for the sexually diseased, but since sacrifices were required from those who had been healed, we infer that some recovered, Ant. 3.11:3 (263). One probably recovered just as one recovered from leprosy.

that is, "by prayer to God", Ant. 3.11:3(264).

Leprosy was of course a disease peculiarly ceremonially unclean. There was evidently no medical cure for it; but some were healed of the disease. The record simply states that a leper sometimes "recovered his natural constitution again". Lepers were segregated. If perchance one recovered, to be reinstated into society, for such an one Moses had appointed "purifications and washings with spring water, and the shaving of all their hair, and enjoined that they should offer many sacrifices of several kinds". Only after all this could they re-enter Jerusalem, Ap. 1.31(281f).

Vows were sometimes made and performed in connection with sicknesses. Even the royal lady Berenice believed this to be effective. Just at the beginning of the great uprising in 66 A. D. we see her in Jerusalem "in order to perform a vow which she had made to God". Josephus adds: "for it is usual with those that had been either afflicted with a distemper, or with any distresses, to make vows: and for thirty days before they are to offer their sacrifices to abstain from wine, and to shave the hair of their head". It is not stated that medicines were used in connection with the vow's performance. In fact, the indication is that only after the cure had been effected, was the vow performed, War 2.15:1(313f).

Diseases were sometimes regarded as punishment from God. The distressing condition of Herod I just before his death (if the record be historically trustworthy), "the superstitious" regarded as punishment for his sin in putting to death the teachers who had caused the golden eagle over the Temple gate to be torn down, War 1.33:5(656). Josephus speaks of these pious Jews as "the superstitious." It must be due to his own biassed judgment and lack of sympathy to appreciate

the Rabbins' viewpoint; for he himself regarded the distempers of Catullus his slanderer as punishment from God, War 7.11:4(453). The Jews generally believed that God punished by sending afflictions of various kinds

Mention is made of hot baths and medicinal springs Tiberias, Life 16(85), Emmaus, War 4.1:3(11), and Calirrhoe, War 1.33:5(659). Emmaus was so called because of the spring of warm water found there, and "useful for healing". The hot baths at Tiberias and the warm spring of Emmaus probably are identical, Ant. 18.2:3(36).[14] Near Baaras there were springs giving both bitter and sweet waters. In a nearby cave there were springs both hot and cold which "are medicinal indeed for other maladies, but especially good for strengthening the nerves", War 7.6:3. Tiberias, Calirrhoe, and Baaras were in modern parlance, health resorts. Our author says there were "baths" there, probably meaning buildings, War 1.21:11(422(, erected to accomodate those who came to regain their health. They were them health resorts of considerable size. Of one Calirrhoe, we read that Herod I visited it to regain health. John of Gischala begged leave from Josephus to visit that at Tiberias. Of the springs at Baaras we read that they were medicinal for other maladies, implying that they were much used.

The general laws of hygiene, and the beneficial results upon health of regularity and simplicity of life, including a staple diet, were well known. We read that during a famine in Judea and Syria the change of food because of the lack of staple foods caused a pestilence to break out before which the people were helpless, having neither "methods of cure nor food", Ant. 15.9:1(300). The Jews' diet

14. Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol V, p.153: "A small place in Galilee, between Tiberias and Gadara, the Talmudic "Hamath" (i.e. hot springs).

was in certain respects regulated by law, and interrupting its regularity produced disastrous results. Of the Essenes we read: "They are long-lived, also, in so much that most of them live above an hundred years, by means of the simplicity of their diet, nay, as I think, by means of the regular course of life they observe also", War 2.8:10(151). Their knowledge of medicine was not scientific. They are reported as diligently studying the ancient writings in search for what was advantageous to the body. To heal sickness, they used roots having medicinal value, and also inquired into "the properties of medicinal stones", ("minerals"; Traill), War 2.8:6(136). The Pharisees also lived abstemiously and despised delicacies in diet, Ant. 18.1:3(12). The Jews of the first century evidently thought that the Mosaic food laws had a hygienic basis.

There are passages that point to a considerable knowledge of medicine among the Palestinian Jews. In War 4.8:4(476f) the Lake Asphaltitis is described. From it was taken a product called bitumen, which was an ingredient of "a great many medicines". Herod I "considered several methods of cure" for his numerous ailments, War 1.33:5(657); Ant. 15.7:7(245-6). Josephus speaks of mines of sulphur and alum in connection with his mention of the medicinal springs at Baaras. But the data are not sufficient to allow the statement that some Palestinian Jews had a broad scientific knowledge of medicines and diseases.

6. The Limitations of Jewish Thought.

The Greek opponents charged the Jews that they had not produced any independent thinkers, blazing new trails of thought and expression, Ap. 2.20(182). Their thought and conduct had been determined for them long ages ago. Others were constantly changing the traditions of their forefathers, thinking it an evidence of wisdom, ever to go be-yond what had been written. But the Jews, they said, were stereotyped and narrowly confined in their thinking. Their literature was limited, dealing only with their principal interest, religion.

Josephus admits the truth of the charge, but has a justification for it. His plea is that their law is so excellent, and is so admirably adapted to all men's needs, that there is no warrant to add anything thereto.[15] The Greeks are constantly searching for, and devising new things, but the result is utter confusion. They thereby also confess the inferiority of their learning. For constant change implies constant attempt to improve what has already been produced. But since the Jewish legislation needs no change it thereby proves its superiority. The fact that it has remained unchanged in its every jot and tittle throughout the centuries is proof that nothing better can be invented. It was made once for all time, agreeable to God's will. Why change it? There is no more "righteous constitution", nor ever will be, since it acknowledges God to

---

15. Josephus has the Stoics, Epicureans and Pythagoreans in mind when he speaks of the three sects of Judaism, but there is no evidence that any one of the Jewish sects borrowed from the Greeks in such passages as Ant. 10.11:7(278f); War 2.8:14(164); Life 2(12); Ant. 15.10:4(371). The comparisons are used simply for the sake of making the sects intelligible to his Hellenistic readers. Rather does the author point with pride to the fact, as he says, that the Greeks were taught by and borrowed from the Jews, Ap. 1.22(164f); 2.39(282f); 1.22(177f); Ant. 14.7:2(116). The impression given in Apion is that the Jews did not care to learn from others.

be the "governor of the universe"; and its enforcement is entrusted to the priesthood. To the priesthood has been entrusted the oversight of every activity among the Jews, Ap. 2.20(183, 185-6).

The test of the Jewish law is not its continual adaptation to change, but its antiquity. This is the "truest touchstone", Ap. 2.38(279). It, then, is superior to all others because more ancient than all others. Josephus devotes much of Apion to this proposition. There is the additional assertion that since older than all other codes, others must have borrowed from the Mosaic code, Ap. 2.39(281).

Josephus also gives a geographical reason for their apparent obscurity as a nation. The Jews are not a maritime people. They live inland, distant from the sea. The Greeks being a seafaring people come in contact with other nations. But they know little about, and make little mention of the Jews because of the inland position of the latter. Besides, the Jews being thus situated, regard it as most essential to live a quiet unadventurous life, tilling the soil, educating their children in the law, and making it their principal business to keep the observances of their forefathers. This is a unique manner of life, but fully justified by its own high character, Ap. 1.13. However, the Jews were known to early historians, but not through their own literature, Ap. 1.13.

Literary activity was not encouraged among the Jews, Ap. 1.7 (37). It was the peculiar privilege of the priests and prophets to write the sacred history of their people, Ap. 1.6(29). The Greeks have an extensive literature, but it has little regard for the truth. In thr first place, they were careless about keeping exact records of their history. The result was that later writers using these ancient records as sources deviated from the truth consciously and

unconsciously. Then too the Greeks were more concerned about literary polish and less about historical truth. They wrote with different motives some to commend, others to criticize. The result was total lack of harmony among them, Ap. 1.5(23f).

But the Jews, regarding perfect agreement as the character of true history, entrusted its sacred history to a certain class pre-eminently fitted for this task. They wrote Israel's history with greatest accuracy, and Josephus ventures this assertion that in the future their history will thus be written. These accounts of their past were written so accurately, because the writers learned the facts from God by inspiration, Ap. 1.7(37); 1.8(38).

Their literature is therefore limited, but it is nevertheless, highly valued by all Jews. The books, twenty-two in number do not disagree with or contradict each other. They contain Israel's history to Artaxerxes, king of Persia. Their history since Artaxerxes did not have the authority of the Old Testament since prophecy ceased with Artaxerxes.

Josephus clearly finds justification and fitness for his own Antiwuities in the fact that he is a priest. Prophets and priests had written Israel's past accurately. Thus he, as a priest, not, however, as they, by divine inspiration, but being a priest by birth, he had made a thorough study of Judaism, and therefore could write a true history, Ap. 1.10(54). He is careful too, to remind his readers that in the Antiquities he has accurately followed the sacred books, meaning the Old Testament scriptures, Ant. 20.11;2(261) it al. He regarded his Antiquities as a supplement to the translation of the Pentateuch into Greek under Ptolomy Philadelphus, Ant. Pref. 3(12-13).

Josephus, perhaps apologetically, says that the Jews were con-

scious of their literary inferiority to the Greeks from the standpoint of style and form, and variety of subjects treated. But regarding the truthfulness of ancient history in their estimation, they were superior to the Greeks, Ap. 1.5(27); cf. War 7.11;5(455). Their standard of wisdom was not ability to write eloquently. They did not encourage the learning of other peoples among themselves. The wise man among them was he, who was versed in the sacred law, and was able to interpret them. This education in the Jewish tradition was severe enough to call forth one's utmost effort; and although there had been many students of the law among them, yet only a few had succeeded in acquiring a thorough knowledge of it, Ant. 20.11; 2(263).

That Josephus acquired the knowledge and language of the Greeks was very unusual. He says that he has so long spoken the Aramaic, that even after a great deal of pains to obtain the learning of the Greeks, and understand the elements of the Greek language, he still has difficulty in pronouncing the Greek exactly, Ant. 20.11;2(262f). In writing his works in Greek, he secured the assistance of some persons skilled in the language, Ap. 1.9(50). The War previous to the Greek revision, he wrote in Aramaic, "in the language of our country". This was not Hebrew, since Hebrew had become an unused language in the first century, so far as the majority of Jews were concerned; and to these the War was addressed. When he says, that he addressed the besieged in Jerusalem in the Hebrew language he probably means the Aramaic dialect, War Pref.1(3); War 6.2;1(96).

That Greek learning or language had not seriously penetrated the Judaism of Palestine seems to be clear from our author. The vast majority of Jews adhered tenaciously to their national language,

with no permission, encouragement, or desire to break away. However, Josephus speaks of King Agrippa II as a student of Greek literature, Life 65(359); Ap. 1.9(51). He says when he had finished his War, he "sold many copies to our own men who understood Greek literature", Ap. 1.9(51). If he refers here to those of his people in Rome and elsewhere, we may assume that outside of Palestine some Jews did study Greek literature.

Josephus says that Justus "was not unskilful in the learning of the Greeks, and independently he undertook to write a history" of the War. Justus was a Palestinian Jew since we find him inciting the people to insurrection against Rome, Life 9(40). In the judgment of our author, Justus "intended by his narrative to subvert the truth" and was therefore an unreliable historian. In this he was like others, presumably Greeks, although our author does not mention any by name, who attempted to write histories of the Jewish War, Ap. 1.8(46). In all this unfavorable criticism of Justus, we must remember that Justus was Josephus' literary rival and political enemy, Life 65.

In the light of what Josephus has recorded concerning the attitude of Palestinian Judaism toward Greek learning, it seems improbable that the Pentateuch was translated into the Greek by Jews from Palestine. The tradition of Aristeas is accepted by Josephus without historical judgment, Ant. 12.2. The story evidently attempts to seek the approval of Palestinian Judaism upon what was done in Alexandria, and in all probability by Alexandrian Jews, who in this center of Hellenistic thought and life had become proficient enough in the Greek to translate the Pentateuch into that language.

CHAP. V. THE RELIGIOUS CUSTOMS AND FAITH OF JUDAISM.

1. Worship and Sacrifice at the Temple.

Sacrifices in the Temple at Jerusalem were performed daily in the morning and about three o'clock in the afternoon, Ant. 14.4:3(65). They were accepted in the morning at the opening of the inner temple, and at noon, by the officiating priests, Ap. 2.8(105). Even in times of war and siege the daily sacrifices, purifications, drinkofferings, and the burning of incense went on with the greatest exactness, War 1.7:4(148), 5(150). Each day sacrifices were offered for Caesar and the Roman people, War 2.10:4(196); Ap. 2.6(77). Sacrifices were also accepted from foreigners, War 2.17:2f.

Josephus gives a detailed description of the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies, War 5.5. Yet there was a certain amount of secrecy in the Temple worship. A wall separated the Holy Place and the inmost shrine from the courts of the Jewish men, War 5.5:6(225). But the worship was not like that of the Greek mystery cults. What was done was known to all the people, yet there was a certain sacredness about its performance that forbade the gazing of the curious and the ceremonially impure. Although our author freely describes the furnishings of the Holy Place, and says that in the Temple's inmost shrine there was nothing at all, yet he also says that what Antiochus, Pompey, Crassus, and Titus found there, "the Jews were not at liberty to reveal to other nations", War 5.5; Ap. 2.8; 7.82. He wished to retain for the Temple worship a hallowed secrecy against the bitter but absurd charges of his opponent Apion.

The Holy Place of the Temple containing the candlestick, table of shew-bread and the altar of incense, Ap. 2.8, was also the sacred

treasury, and storehouse for provisions, both devoted to sacred uses.

In the sacred treasury lay gifts from all parts of the world from both Jews and Gentiles, Ant. 18.3:5(82); cf. War 6.5:2(282), as also the half-shekel taxes, Ant. 18.9:1(312), from all Jews everywhere. Out of this sacred treasury appropriations toward the expenses of the Temple worship were made. Corban, War 2.9:4(175), Ap. 1.22(167), gifts peculiarly devoted to God were also placed in the sacred treasury. In charge of this was a chief treasurer, Ant. 20.8:11(194), Cf. 14.7:1, under whom were subordinate officers, Ant. 15.11:4(408).

We read also of harpers and singers of hymns, War 2.15:4(321). Whether the Levites filled and performed all the offices of the Temple not specifically connected with the sacrifices cannot be determined. The order of offices were: first, that of the high-priest who had general supervisionoof the Temple worship; secondly, the priests; and finally the Levites who in Josephus' indefinite language "ministered in the Temple". They are, however, specifically mentioned as singers of hymns, Ant. 20.9:6; 3.11:1.

Josephus gives two reasons for the building of the Temple at Leontopolis in Egypt. One was the belief of Onias, its builder, that the erecting of such a temple had been predicted by the prophet Isaiah. The other reason was Onias' deposition from the high-priesthood. Josephus questions the sincerity of Onias' petition to Ptolemy for permission to build this temple, War 7.10; Ant. 13.3:1. He also dismisses reference to the temple with brief remarks. For personal reasons, and to draw the Jews away from Jerusalem as their central place of worship, says Josephus, Onias built the Temple. For our author it was a poor makeshift in comparison with Herod's temple in Jerusalem.

---

1. Cf. War 7.10; 5.5; Ap. 2.23(193); Ant. 4.8:5(201), see Müller, Fl. Jos. gegen Apion p. 314.

2. Worship in the Synagogue.

The synagogues of the Jews especially in the large cities of Palestine and elsewhere were sometimes large and beautiful structures. The synagogue at Antioch Josephus calls a temple. It had been adorned with great magnificence, due to the favorable attitude and beneficence of the Syrian kings since Antiochus Epiphanes' time. It also had a large membership of both Jews and Greek proselytes, War 7.3;3(45). Of the synagogue in Tiberias Josephus says: "it was a large edifice, and capable of receiving a great number of people," Life 54(277). It is also highly probable that the "place of public exercises" in Damascus mentioned in War 2.20:2 was the Jewish synagogue there. In this place the people of Damascus had imprisoned the Jews and had killed 10,000 of them. The number is exaggerated, but it indicates a large colony of Jews in Damascus. That they were religiously active is evident from the fact that many of the wives of the Damascenes were Jewish proselytes, War 2.20:2(560). Josephus speaks of a synagogue in Caesarea, where there was a colony of wealthy and influential Jews, War 2.14:4(285f). We read of an assembly of Jews in Alexandria. Since the synagogue was a general meeting place for the Jews there probably, upon this occasion, held the assembly in their synagogue, War 7.10:1(412).

In Julius Caesar's time there was a large measure of freedom for the Jews who lived in Rome, Ant. 14.10:8(214). The purpose of inserting the Roman decrees in Antiquities 14.10 and 16.6 for Josephus was to show the esteem which the Roman rulers had for the Jews. Caesar Augustus issued a decree granting religious liberty to all Jews throughout the Empire, Ant. 16.6:2(164).

There were then synagogues wherever colonies of Jews were found. Some were built by the seaside,[2] Ant. 14.10:23(258); cf. Ant. 12.12: 12(103). The Jews had entire control of their places of worship, Ant. 19.6:3(305); this was consistent with Roman policy. No doubt, the Jews were, nevertheless, frequently molested. This is evident from almost all the references to the synagogue in Josephus. But when complaint was made, the Jews' rights of worship were usually well protected by the Roman officials, Ant. 19.6. Those transgressing these rights were sometimes severely punished.

Just as the Temple, so the synagogue had to be ceremonially undefiled for the people to worship therein. Placing a statue in the synagogue in Dora not only defiled the sanctuary, but also prevented the people from entering the synagogue while it was defiled. The building had to be purified after the statue had been removed, before the Jews could again gather in it, Ant. 19.6:3(305); War 2.14: 5(289).

Attendance upon the synagogue services on the Sabbaths was regular and general. In Caesarea we find the Jews "crowding apace to their synagogue", cf. Ap. 1.22(209). It seems to have served as a magnet drawing and golding the Jews together. There on the Sabbaths the law was studied and reflected upon, Ap. 2.17(175); Ant.16. 2:3(43). More freely than in the Temple, the Jews met in the synagogues with their wives and children to offer their prayers and sacrifices to God, Ant. 14.10:24(260). There the fasts were observed, Life 57(295).

---

2. Building the synagogue by the seaside was perhaps an early custom among the Jews to avoid ceremonial uncleanness contracted by mingling with the idolatry of the city.-- See Art. Synagogue, Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible. Vol. IV p. 638f.

3. Religious Life in the Jewish Home.

In scattered references in Apion Bk. II Josephus gives us a picture of a religiously ideal Jewish home, and, no doubt, in gereral, the picture was true to fact. It was a home where in early childhood the boy was taught the elements of the Jewish law, Ap. 2.17(173). Josephus regarded himself as a precocious child, but to all Jewish children he ascribes a knowledge of the law unknown among the children of other peoples, Ap. 2.17; Life 2(8f), so that the Jewish child very early knew to distinguish right from wrong.

The home was one of simple habit and frugal diet, according to the precepts given by their great legislator Moses, who had made provision even for the home life which tended to piety. Their daily food, social contact with the members of the family and with outsiders diligence in their daily tasks, and even their periods of rest were enjoined and regulated by the law, Ap. 2.32(234); 39(281-2). "Under the law", says Josephus, "as under a father and a master we live, that we may be guilty of no sin, neither voluntary nor out of ignorance", Ap. 2.17(174). And to this master the Jews voluntarily submitted themselves, Ap. 2.31(220).

The parents must be honored by the children next to God. Stoning to death was the punishment for the son who failed to live as a true son, Ap. 2.27(206); 30(217). A part of this duty was the proper burial of the parents by the children, War 5.13:3(544). Even the attempt to behave unjustly toward parents was punishable by death, Ap. 2.30(217); cf. Ant. 4.8:24(261f). Submission to the law was the motto of every Jewish home. Respect for elders and imitation of their deeds was enjoined upon the youth, Ap. 2.27(206); 25(204). It is need-

less to say that no idols of any sort were found in the Jewish home. Industry, orderliness, and temperance characterized it.

In the relation of husband and wife due regard for each other's rights according to their respective status was observed. The duty of the wife was obedience in all things, and the husband's duty was to be faithful. The Jewish laws of chastity were to be fully observed, Ap. 2.24.

The law allowed no feasting at the birth of a child, when there might be the temptation to drunkenness. But children were reared in sobriety, Ap. 2.25(204). Moreover the Jews had a regard for children so that child life in every stage, born and unborn, was sacred, Ap. 2.24(202).[3] Extravagance in the burial of the dead was not allowed. The "nearest relations" of the dead "performed the obsequies". Lamentation was a part of the funeral, and even passers-by participated in the funeral rites. After the funeral both the house and its inmates were purified, Ap. 2.26(205).

The daily religious life of the Jew in his home did not tend to stir up a desire for war but rather fostered peace and harmony with all men. Daily charity toward each other, and toward strangers was enjoined by the law, Ap. 2.39(283). A sort of communism was practiced by all Jews, and not only by the Essenes. That grace was said with meals may be safely assumed, Ant. 12.2:12(97); War 2.8:5(131).

A summary of the religious life of the Jewish home is well expressed by Josephus when he says: "They (the laws) teach not impiety, but the truest piety in the world. They do not make men hate one

---

3. J. G. Müller, Fl. Jos. gegen Apion p.320 commenting on Ap.2.24 (202) says: "Gegen das Abtreiben giebt es im Pentateuch kein Gesetz. Es war bei den Juden nicht nothig."

another freely; they are enemies to injustice, they take care of righteousness, they banish idleness and expensive living, and instruct men to be content with what they have, and to be laborious in their calling", Ap. 2.41(291).

4. The Sabbath

In the Hebrew the word "Sabbath denotes rest from all sorts of work", says Josephus, Ap. 2.2(27); Ant. 1.1:1. The definition is legalistic. We find the day designated either the "Sabbath" of the "seventh day". It was regarded as their most important institution, War 4.2:3(100); see prominence of Sabbath in Rom. decrees). The Jews had the greatest regard for it; everywhere in Palestine and elsewhere they clung to it. In the decrees of the Greeks and Romans permission to Jews outside Palestine to observe the Sabbath is frequently mentioned, Ant. 14.10:20(242); cf. 14.10:23(258). For observance of this day the Jews were not to be fined, nor was any suit to be brought against them, Ant. 14.10:24(260). Josephus says that some Gentiles took over the seventh day from the Jews as a day of rest from work, Ap. 2.39.

There is little legalistic casuistry in connection with the Sabbath, in Josephus. But the references are based upon legalism, e.g. the phrases "customs and laws" and "learning it exactly", Ap. 2:17(175). In the evening of the day of preparation in the city of Jerusalem one duly appointed, blew a trumpet, thus marking the beginning of the Sabbath, and also in the evening of the Sabbath the trumpet was sounded in the closing hour of the day, War 4.9:12(582). The trumpet gave notice when to leave off work and when to begin again. The Sabbath then began, on the day of preparation, at the ninth hour, 3:00 o'clock P.M., Ant. 16.6:1(163).

The day was primarily for rest and quietness, Ant. 12.1:1(4). It was unlawful for the Jews to travel long distances on the Sabbath and festival days, Ant. 13.8:4(252); Life 32(159). Upon this day the

Jews were in many places excused from appearing in civil courts by a decree of Caesar Augustus, Ant. 16.6:2(163). This day for the Jews was to be devoted to the study of "their customs and laws".[4] It was then that the Jews usually assembled in their synagogues, and there reflected upon the law, and thereby avoided its transgression, Ant. 16.2:3(43). This provision for the hearing and learning of the law on the Sabbath was a thing neglected by other law-givers but not so by Moses, Ap. 2.1:17(175). And it was as unlawful to neglect the synagogue service on the Sabbath as to refuse to be insudtriously employed during the other six days of the week.

With so much in Josephus that deals with war and sedition, the reader expects mention of the keeping of the Sabbath during times of war. This became a problem during the Maccabean revolt in 168 B.C. Mattathias, seeing that the exigencies of war demanded a modification of the strict interpretation of the Sabbath law, urged that unless they desired to become their own enemies, the Jews should at least defend themselves on the Sabbath. Their enemies were taking advantage of the Jews' strict piety, Ant. 12.6:2(274f). Previously Ptolemy, son of Lagus, had seized Jerusalem on a Sabbath, because then all the Jews were at rest, and refused even to defend themselves, Ant. 12.1:1(4). Josephus says this new law allowing Jews to defend themselves on the Sabbath continued to his day, Ant. 12.6:2(274f). Pompey prepared for the attack on the Sabbath, for, says Josephus, "the Jews only acted defensively on the Sabbath day", Ant. 14.4:2(63).

---

4. The words in Life 54:276: "I also set many persons all the way that led from Tarichеae to Tiberias, that they might communicate from one to another" suggest due observance of the prohibition against travel on the Sabbath.

During the war 66-73 A. D. there must have been frequent occasion to break the quiet of the Sabbath by attacks upon the enemy. The fordes of the Jews were generally in a demoralized condition, and in their almost fanatical hatred of the enemy they forgot the Sabbath, and attacked, War 2.19:1,2; 2.18:10. But usually only the direst necessity allowed the Jews to engage in fighting. Some preferred to undergo danger rather than fight, Life 32(169). Nor were the Jews allowed to sue for peace on the Sabbath, War 4.2:5(99). Even among the Jews of the Dispersion there was usually no fighting on the Sabbath, but when necessity urged, they would march out when the Sabbath had already begun, and attack the enemy, Ant. 18.9:6(354). It seems that the Mattathias modification later received the interpretation which the particular occasion and attitude of the Jews at the particular moment gave it. But the ideal Sabbath as portrayed by Josephus was one of quietness and complete cessation from all activity, so that the people might worship in their synagogues. For the Sabbatical year see Ant. 13.8:1(234).

4. Ceremonial Customs.

Among the Jews the ceremonial customs were many and elaborate, War 5.5:7(237); Ant. 3 and 4. Those in connection with the Temple are chiefly related to festivals and holy days, sacrifices, and the priesthood.

Passover was the great sacrificial festival. Sacrifices were them slain from the ninth to the eleventh hour, War 6.9:3(422). At this time it was customary for the priests to open the temple-gates shortly after midnight, Ant. 18.2:29. Passover was celebrated for seven days, Ant. 3.10:5(249). The feast of Tabernacles of eight days duration was celebrated in the seventh month, Tisri, Ant. 11.5:5(154). War 6.5:3(300). Then the people built tabernacles to God in the Temple area, Ant. 13.13:5(322). Pentecost was observed fifty days after the 14th Nisan, the day of the Passover feast. At this festival, the priests performed special sacred functions during the night, War 6.5:3(299). All the annual festivals were joyous occasions, and were attended by vast numbers of Jews, Ant. 11.5:3.

Upon the annual fast day (Day of Atonement) all the people observed a solemn fast, War 5.5:7(236). It was then only that the highpriest entered the Holy of Holies, Lev. 16; War 3.10:3. Xylophory was a festival when it was custom to supply wood for the Temple altar, War 2.17:6(425). The festival called "lights" was instituted in the Maccabean period when temple worship was restored. It was also an eightday festival; but Josephus' language seems to imply its distinct character apart from the festival of Tabernacles, Ant. 12.7:7. Another festival among the Jews was the Niceteria commemorating their victory over Nicanor in the Maccabean period. This was celebrated

in the twelfth month of the Jewish calendar, the month Adar, Ant. 12.10:5(412). The day of the new moon was a holy day. Upon this day in addition to the daily sacrifice, two bulls, seven lambs of the first year, and a kid of the goats were offered for the expiation of sins, Ant. 3.10:2.

There were certain ceremonial regulations in connection with the several Temple courts. Lepers and those having sexual diseases were kept out of Jerusalem itself. Women, during certain periods were not allowed to enter the Temple area, War 5.5:6. It seems that Essenes were excluded also, Ant. 18.1:5(19). Both men and priests had to be ceremonially pure to enter the inner court of the Temple, War 5.5:6(227). Only the priests were allowed to enter the place of sacrifice; and only the high-priest could enter the Holy of Holies, Ap. 2.8(104).

Great care was exercised to keep the priesthood ceremonially pure. The laws concerning the marriage of priests and the high-priest were stringent, Ap. 1.7(30f); Ant. 3,12:2; cf. Ant. 13.10:5(292); 13. 13:5(372) only for illustration, not for historical truth. One with physical defect could not minister at the altar, Ant. 14.13:10(366). But one of priestly family, yet having physical defects was permitted to enter the Holy Place, but not to sacrifice; nor was he permitted to wear the priestly garments, War 5.5:7(228); Ap. 2.8(104); Ap. 1. 31(284). The high-priest officiated at the altar on Sabbaths, new moons, and the annual festivals and holy days. Only on the annual fast day did he wear the high-priestly garments which were in the custody of the civil authorities and kept in the tower of Antonia, War 5.5:7(230); Ant. 15.11:4;18.4:3.

The priests of the four tribes numbered over 20,000 ministering

at the altar periodically. When the period of a group ended, they met the succeeding group at midday, and delivered the keys and sacred vessels to their successors, Ap. 2.8(108).[5]

Circumcision was one of the principal requirements of the ceremonial code. But some laxity in its observance was evident. Josephus cites the instance of Izates of Adiabene. Ananias, his instructor, says to Izates, hesitant about accepting circumcision, that he might worship God without being circumcised, since it was "omitted out of necessity". But to another, Eleazar, this hesitancy was great impiety, Ant. 20.2:4(44-45). When some Jews would compel certain men to be circumcised, Josephus says: "Every one ought to worship God according to his own inclinations, and not to be constrained by force, Life 23(113). When Hyrcanus subdued the Idumeans, they, expressing a desire to live among the Jews, submitted to circumcision, and were henceforth regarded as Jews, Ant. 13.9:1(258); War 2.17:10(454); Ant. 13.11:3(314).

Circumcision was not a rite peculiar to the Jews, says Josephus. The Egyptian priests were circumcised, Ap. 2.13(141). But here we are on apologetic ground. Josephus' other references permit the inference that circumcision since the days of Antiochus Epiphanes was a rite peculiarly Jewish, and in general rigidly observed, War 1. 12(34); Ant. 20.7:1.

Among the several purifications was that after a funeral. Dead bodies were regarded as unclean, War 4.6:3(381f). The high-priest was not allowed to touch them, Ant. 13.12:2(277). Cleansing accompanied by sacrifices was required after a funeral, and even the house

---

5. The Jewish Encyc. Vol. X;194 speaks of 24 families or classes of priests in post-exilic times, cf. Life 1.1; Ant. 7.14:7 and Muller's comment on Ap. 2.8(108). J. G. Müller, Fl. Jos. Gegen Apion p. 269.

wherein the dead had lain was purified. To build a house upon the site of an ancient burial place was forbidden. Removing a sepulchre rendered the transgressor unclean for seven days, Ant. 18.2:3(38).

There is frequent mention of the burial customs of that day. As among many ancient peoples, among the Jews, it was a dreaded dishonor to be left unburied, Ant. 13.15:5(403). Even strangers among the Jews were given proper burial, Ap. 2.29(211). Suicides were punished by being left unburied until sunset, War 3.8:5(377). The condemned and crucified were taken down and buried before sunset, War 4. 5:2(317). Among the wealthy and royalty we find elaborate burials and sepulchres. Herod I buried the young man Aristobulus in a prepared sepulchre with a large quantity of spices and ornaments, Ant. 15.3:4(61); cf. 16.7:1(179). There were both private and public mournings for the dead, War 3.9:5(436). Lamentation, hired mourners, musical instruments (flutes), and sometimes lamentation for several days, were accompaniments of burials, War 3.9:5(437); cf. 2.1:1(1). Neighbors usually accompanied in the lamentation in private funerals, Ap. 2.26(205). Funeral feasts proportionate to one's financial resources, (some disproportionate), were given. The usual time of mourning for the dead was seven days, Ant. 17.8:4(200); but see 4.8: 33(259); 4.8:49(330). One who failed to give the customary funeral feast was esteemed an unholy person, War 2.1:1(1).

Since the law of foods was an important part of Moses' legislation leading to piety of life, the Jews were insistent upon its observance, Ap. 2.17(174). Among the Dispersion provision was sometimes made that foods which the Jews were enjoined by their law to eat, were supplied for them, Ant. 14.10:24(261); 12.2:12(94). According to a decree of P. Dolabella, consul with M. Antonius, the Jews

were excused from military service because in military life they could not procure the foods that they as Jews were required to eat, Ant. 14.10:12(225f). During times of famine and war the commandments regarding foods were necessarily broken, Ant. 15.9:1(303); War 1.2:7(64). We read of a Jewish prohibition against use of oil "prepared by foreigners", Life 13(74); Ant. 12.3:1(120). This was probably a part of their food code. Josephus also records an incident of some priests who did not forget their ceremonial food laws even in captivity, but who lived upon figs and nuts; Life 3((14); cf. Dan. 1:8f. In these words we have reference to the Pharisees' strict observance of their food laws, cf. Ant. 18.1:3(12).

Other purifications and washings mentioned are those pertaining to sexual relations, Ap. 2.23(198); before touching the law, Ant. 12.2:12(106); before entering the sacred precincts of the Temple, War 1.11:6(229); and when healed of leprosy, Ap.1.31(282). Josephus speaks of "seven degrees of purity" that he intends to mention in the course of his writings.[7] This phrase in War Pref. 10, by Whiston is rendered "seven purifications or days of purity". Josephus says he intends to describe the festivals, the seven, purifications, the sacred ministrations of the priests, with the garments of the priests and of the high-priests. There is a discussion of all except the purifications in War. In Ant. 18.4:3 we read that in connection with the annual festivals and fast days the garments of the high-priest were taken from the tower of Antonia seven days before the festivals and fast days, and purified by the high priest. Josephus is probably referring to this period of purification continuing through seven days. But the reference is in the Antiquities and not in the War.

In critical times and experiences fasting was common. When threatened by the Parthians, Isates who had become a Jew, made supplications to God, threw himself on the ground, put ashes on his head and fasted", Ant. 20.4:2(89); cf. 19.8:2(348). It was lawful for the ruler to proclaim a fast when the occasion warranted it, Life 56. Our author mentions a fast, evidently well known at the time, in the third month (Sivan), but its purpose is not stated, Ant. 14.4:3. Herod I also took possession of Jerusalem in the third month "on the solemnity of the fast", Ant. 14.16:4. The same fast as in Ant. 14.4:3 is referred to here, as the context of Ant. 14.16:4 states.[6]

In Apion 2.38 there is reference to the lighting of lamps, as a custom among the Jews. Muller in his comment suggests that possibly Josephus had in mind torch-festivals among the Greeks. Yet Müller does not identify the custom among the Jews with that.

The references to ceremonial customs, in general, are scattered and incidental. Just as there were many moral rules and regulations not mentioned by Josephus, so there were also many ceremonial customs in his time, not given space in his works, Ap. 2.27:208; cf. War 5.5:7(337). Perhaps it may be safe to assume that where he attempts discussion of the laws of his people as in Apion those laws of his people which have a counterpart among other nations, but which, nevertheless for him, in his apologetics, are superior to the laws of other nations, are uppermost in his mind. When the references are only incidental, we may regard them as the more reliable because they are usually assumed to be known.

---

6. There were three fasts in the month Sivan, but two, on the 25th and 27th, commemorated events that happened after the time of the references in Josephus. These references then must refer to the fast on the 23rd Sivan commemorating the time when the Israelites are said to have ceased bringing the firstlings to Jerusalem in the days of Jeroboam. See Jewish Encyc. Vol. V. p. 347.

6. The Faith of Standard Judaism.

Josephus regarded Pharisaism as standard Judaism. The Pharisees direct the people in the things pertaining to divine worship, prayers, and sacrifices, and the people gladly obey their precepts. The Pharisees also are considerate toward the public and are inclined to be lenient and merciful, Ant. 13.10:6(294f); 18.1:3(5). They had also given the oral tradition to the people and the people believed them readily. The teachings of the Pharisees were accepted by the Zealots, Ant. 18.1:6(23). The Pharisees were best skilled in the laws of the Jews, Life 38(191); Ant. 13.10:5(238f). We conclude therefore that what they taught concerning God, providence, human conduct, oral tradition and future rewards and punishments was generally accepted by the people.

- Josephus also employs the words "law" and laws" in Apion meaning both the Pentateuch and its oral legalistic development. So that his presentation of the religious customs and faith of Judaism as found in Apion, especially in Bk. II, and based as it is upon legalism, is for him that of standard Judaism or Pharisaism.

God

Concerning the nature of God we read that He is unbegotten, immutable, eternal, whose beauty is beyond human comprehension, known by His power, but unknowninin His essence, Ap. 2.16(167); cf. Ant. 18. 8:5(281). He is the omnipresent sustainer of all things complete in Himself, needing not the help of other beings in creating and sustaining the universe. He is absolutely "perfect and happy; the source, the upholder, and end of all things. Men trace Him in His creation, and in the blessings He bestows upon mankind better than they trace

any other being, but the Divine form is ineffable, Ap. 2.22(190). All things were created by an act of His sovereign will, and became good, Ap. 2.22(192). His name is so awful that Jews are forbidden to pronounce it. Moses forbade ridiculing the gods of the Gentiles because they have the name of God, Ant. 2.12; 4(276); War 5.5:7(235); Ap. 2.33(237).

In Josephus' discussion of the nature and character of God we find references to the first century Jewish attitude toward idolatry. To the Jews God, because His form is incomprehensible, cannot be expressed by material things. It is therefore, impious to do so, Ap. 2.21(191). Images of God and of animals, even of human beings, as in the sculpture, paintings and upon the coins of the Gentiles, were not allowed among the Jews, Ap. 2.16(74). However, they were not forbidden to pay honors and offer perpetual sacrifice for the emperors and the Romen people, Ap. 2.16(74). The animal worship of Egypt and the polytheistic mythology of the Greeks were caused by ignorance of God's true nature, Ap. 235(250).

Our author is instructive in showing the actual reaction toward this aspect of encroaching Hellenism. The reaction of the people is more violent than that of the rulers.[8] About the rulers we read that Onias, the high-priest, received a letter from Areus, king of the Lacedaemonians, bearing the seal of an eagle, with a dragon in its claws, Ant. 12.4:10(227). Hyrcanus had a castle with animals engraven upon it, Ap. 12.4:11(230). Alexandra had portraits of her two sons, Ant. 15.2:6(26-27). We find statues in Agrippa's palace, Ant. 19.9:1(357). Hyrcanus, the Hasmonean high-priest, permitted the Atheneans to erect his statue in brass, Ant. 14.8:5(153). See also the incident of Agrippa's tragic death of whom Josephus says: "He

8. Cf. Aboda Zara III,1; IV,6; see Yonge, Philo Judaeus, Vo.III,p.151.

kept himself entirely pure; and was exactly careful in the observance of the laws of his country", Ant. 19.7:3(331).

The pious objection to Herod's ornaments was regarded by the Jewish leaders as silly, War 2.17:3; cf Ant. 15.8:2(179). They urged the people to rebuild the cloisters joining the Temple and Antonia, which they had destroyed, War 2.16:5. The rulers also assured Herod that the golden eagle over the Temple gate had been pulled down without their approval, Ant. 17.6:2; 15.11:5(416); War 5.4:4(181).

The feeling of the people was usually that of indignation at the intrusions of a profane Hellenism into the sacred precincts of their holy Temple, War 2.9:3; 2.10:1f. Whatever they may have received in compensation, they could not rest content to allow their holy place to be desecrated by the unclean hands of the uncircumcised Gentile. They continued to feel dissatisfied. Their simple Jewish piety sensed danger, Ant. 15.8:3(281). All it required was the torch of a reckless Florus to kindle the conflagration of Zealotism.

In Josephus it is held that God sustains a unique relation to the Jews. They regarded God as the giver of their sacred books,[9] (22, - law, prophets, and writings), through Moses and successive prophets, who were divinely inspired for the task, Ant. 18.8:2(266); Ap. 2.16(163); 1.7(37); 1.8. That God was the author of the Jewish laws, and not of the Gentiles' laws, could be determined by a comparison of them, Ap. 2.16(163). God was also the head of the peculiar form of government among the Jews, called a "Theocracy", Ap. 2.16(165). Every part of the Jewish life related to their God. In their national

---

8a. "οἱ δέ" beginning Ant. 17.6:4 has the "principal men" of the preceding paragraph as its antecedent. Margoliouth's rendering "The people", is incorrect, and Shiletto's "Those present", too indefinite for "οἱ δέ".

9. Einleitung in das Alte Testament: C.H. Cornill, p.273: "Diese Zahl 22 wird dadurch gewonnen, dass Ruth mit Judicum und Threni mit Jeremia

history He proved to be their supporter, general, judge, deliverer, and arbitrator, cf. War 5.9:4(377, 380, 386, 390, 389, 400).

But He is also the God of all men, Ap. 2.23(193). The fact is that the great philosophers among the Greeks from Pythagoras to the Stoics agreed with the Jews upon the nature of God, but because of the polytheistic superstition of the masses, they dared not disclose their views, Ap.2.16(168). Plato also dismissed the polytheistic fables of Homer from his ideal state, and in many other things he initiated Moses, Ap. 2.36. Because God is the God of all men, Josephus proposes a single Temple as the one central place of worship for all men, Ap. 2.23(193). Not only does God rule over the lives of the Jews, but over the lives of all. "He is the Father and Lord of all things", Ant. Pref. 4(20).

It is clear that Josephus shared the current view among the Jews on Providence. The direct intervention of God in the affairs of men is everywhere taught. Several synonymous phrases are found; e.g. πρόνοια, usually translated "Providence"; (numerous passages): θεία πρόνοια, Ant. 10.10:5(214); δαιμόνιον πρόνοιαν, Ant. 13.11:3(314); προμήθεια, Ant. 17.13:5(354). All live in God, and His care extends to all, Ant. 12.2:2(22). He is the inspector of men's lives, Ap. 2.16(160). All the universe is the subject of His providence, Ant. 12.2:2(22).

His relation to His creation is expressed in various ways: πρόνοια ποιεῖσθαι, in many passages; ἐφορᾶν, Ap. 2.19(181); τὸν θεὸν ἐπιστρέφοντα

---

zusammengenommen und nicht besonders gezahlt werden. Es kann nun aber gar keinem zweifel unterliegen, dass diese Zahlungen kunstlich und rein willkurlich sind and lediglich auf eine Spielerei hinauslaufen; fur die Geschichte des Kanons sind die Zahlen 22 und 27 vollig bedeutungslos".

Note: The number with the 22 of Josephus, and not mentioned in the above quotation is the 27 mentioned by Hieronymus, and cited by Cornill.

διδόπειν , Ap. 2.41(294); τὸν γὰρ ἅπαντα συνεπόμενον, κ.τ.λ., Ant. 12.2:2(22); κυβερνᾶσθαι τὰ σύμπαντα, Ant. 10.11:7(278). "God sees all things, and hence He bestows a happy life upon those that follow Him, but plunges such as do not walk in the paths of righteousness into inevitable miseries", Ant. Pref. 4(20). He loves mankind, Ant. Pref. 4(24). He is τῷ κηδεμόνι θεῷ, War 3.8:7(387). Even the secrets of men's hearts God knows, Ap. 2.16(160).

God is the judge and rewarder of men. Josephus calls Him, τῷ κριτῇ, War 5.9:4(390); τὸν δ' ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ δικαστήν, War 1.32:3(630). All men are rewarded according to their deeds. The disobedient are punished by God, Ant. 6.7:2f; 8.13:6 et al. No sinner escapes Him, Ant. 4.8:389, 286); 5.1:26(109); 7.1:6(45). Even God's people are punished by those whom God chooses, e.g. the Romans during the war, Ant. 20.8:5.

The Pharisees' view of fate is chiefly contained in the sections dealing with the sects. "They ascribe all to fate, and yet allow that to act as is right, or the contrary, is principally in the power of men, although fate does cooperate in every action, War 2.8:14(162-3). "When they determine that all things are done by fate, they do not take away the freedom from men of acting as they think fit; since their notion is that it hath pleased God that events should be decided in part by the council of fate, in part by such men as will accede thereunto acting therein virtuously or viciously, Ant. 18.1:3(13).

In the single references, where there is no conscious purpose of stating a doctrinal belief, we discover better the view of Judaism concerning God's place in human conduct. Separated from these references the "sects" passages become obscure. For the Jew it was only God and man. "εἱμαρμένη", as separate from God, was unknown idea.

When the "sects"passages are studied in the light of the single references, we conclude that what Josephus meant by εἱμαρμένη was the orderly and guiding activity of God in the world, Ant. 17.13:5(354); 20.8:5(166); War 5.9:1(355); 5.8:2(345). Judaism assented to this.

Yet his Hellenistic tendencies often led him not only to inconsistency of speech, but also to confusion of thought. He attempted to blend the Jewish view of God's providence based upon ethical monotheism with the Gentile view of fate based upon polytheism. He arrived at a contradiction. He used terminology which would appeal to his Gentile readers. But views almost diametrically opposed cannot be synthesized by a sympathetic and careful use of words. The result is, it is neither theology nor philosophy; and if taken seriously, from their respective viewpoints, neither Jew nor Greek could appreciate or accept it.

God's activity among men is displayed in various ways. Through Moses, God gave the Jews a revelation of Himself, and provided a detailed code of laws, Ap. 2.16. Besides, just as God is everywhere in the world, so His revealed law has penetrated all lands, Ap. 2.59(284). By a knowledge of His character through His works and blessings, and by the study and practice of His revealed laws, men learn the ways of virtue and its reward, as also the penalty of sin, both present and future.

Then, too, God speaks directly to the individual, and gives him a sense of security when he is living virtuously, Ap. 2.30(218). Moses believed that "he had God for his guide and counsellor", Ap. 2.16(160). A consciousness that God sees, is a restraint from sin, Ap. 2.16(160).

The history of the Jews shows God's providence. When Israel

committed herself to God, and trusted solely in Him in her crises, she was delivered. The weapons of war have never been Israel's help and security. Meddling with them was always disastrous for Israel, War 5.9:4.

Prayer causes God to intervene in men's behalf. Onias, a righteous man, prayed for rain in a draught, and God sent rain, Ant. 14.2:1(22). Sometimes God gave signs to men showing His approval or disapproval. God approved the people's steadfast refusal to tolerate Caius' statue by sending great showers of rain, and as it were out of a clear sky, insomuch that Petronius, the Roman governor of Syria, was convinced that God took care of His people, Ant. 18.8:6 (296); cf. 19.8:2. Because of his regard for Jewish customs and worship Petronius was at once rewarded by the providential death of Caius, whereby the life of Petronius was spared, Ant. 18.8:9. The Jews in general shared the belief of their day in omens.

Angels also are messengers of God to perform His will among men, War 5.9:4(388); cf. Ant. 10.1:5(21); 5.8:3(284); 7.13:3(327); 7.13:4(329). In these citations the angel and the pestilence are hardly synonymous. The angel is rather the agent bringing the pestilence from God. There are other passages referring to angels. The angels upon Jacob's ladder, Gen. 28:12, "seemed more excellent than human", Ant. 1.19:1(279). Jacob's wrestler, (Gen. 32:24, a man), is a"phantom" who turns out to be a divine angel, Ant. 1.20:2(331-2). Gideon's angel, Jud. 6:11f, is an apparitioniin the shape of a young man, Ant. 5.6:2(213); 5.8:1(277). The angels sent to Sodom, Gen. 19, are "beautiful boys whom the Sodomites resolved to enjoy by force and violence; we notice here the Hellenizing touch of the author, Ant. 1. 11.3(200)

Agrippa calls "the holy angels of God" to witness, War 2.16:4(401). The most"holy part of our law" was given "by angels, or ambassadors", Ant. 15.5:3(136).

The idea of divine agency as the function of angels runs through all these passages except the last. Josephus evidently accepted the angelology of the Old Testament; but he considerably Hellenizes the accounts, e.g. Ant. 1.11:3(200).

Then too, through predictive prophecy God also foretold His will to men. Isaiah foretold the Building of the Temple at Leontopolis in Egypt, Ant. 13.3:1; War 4.6. Hod revealed the career of Herod I to an Essene, Menahem, Ant. 15.10:5. The gift of divination was regarded as an endowment of peculiar wisdom, and was a common method of learning God's will in crises. Yet divination was not regarded as similar to the great work of the literary prophets, in that the Old Testament Scriptures formed part of the prophets' revelations, Ap. 1.8(41). The element of ecstasy was common to first century A. D. divination, and the earliest prophets of the Old Testament. In Josephus' own experience, as he tells it, his capture by Vespasian was preceded by a combination of a dream from God, and answer to prayer, knowledge of the "prophecies in the sacred books", ecstasy, and his own native shrewdness, War 3.8:3.

The dream was evidently a vehicle of divine revelation. Archelaus' government was to cease, Ant. 17.13:3. Glaphyra likewise heard her former husband Alexander in a dream predict her speedy death, which death occurred a few days after the dream, Ant. 17.13:4. The Jews regarded dreams as divine, since they were an incentive to virtue, Ant. 17.13:5(354).

Man

In all creation man is preeminent. Man's soul is a "loan" from God, "a portion" of the Divinity that inhabits our bodies, War 3.8;5(372). This loan is to be repaid to God only when He requires it. Consequently suicide is sternly forbidden.. Suicides are placed in the darkest place in Hades, and even their posterity are punished. It is a crime unknown to animals, and a sin against the Creator. The law of self-preservation is the law of all life. Suicides are enemies to themselves, and guilty of the sin of ingratitude to God. It is as though one were endeavoring to run away from God, "the best of all masters". The crime was punished by exposing the bodies of suicides unburied until sunset. Thus reasons Josephus besieged in the cave at Jotapata, War 3.8;5. Elsewhere he says it is lawful and also noble for Jews to be slain in a defense of their customs and laws, Ap. 2.30(218); 32(232); War 1.33;2(650).

Man is of dual nature, composed of body and soul. The body of man is corruptible and perishes. It is alien to the soul. The soul is the seat of feeling and emotion, but its sensibility may be dulled, so that it cannot respond to the approaches of gentleness, War 5.12;4(526). The body is the prison-house of the soul. When not distreacted by the body, the soul has sweet rest in union with God because of its likeness to Him. Death is common to all men, and brings liberty to souls by sending them into their own place of putity, where they are to be insensible to all sorts of misery. Souls tied to mortal bodies are partakers of their miseries, and are really dead. The union of divine and mortal is disagreeable. But the soul, invisible as God Himself, is the governor of the body. The incorruptible soul causes everything it touches to live and flourish, and

upon its departure the body withers and dies, War 7.8:7(348).

The longer passages, War 3.8:7 sq.; 7.8:7 sq., are too speculative and Hellenized to give us a fair idea of what the larger majority of Jews thought about the soul. We probably approximate their view in such passages as War 1.33:2(650); Ant. 18.1:3(14); and Ap. 2.30(218). It is simply this: souls are immortal, and at death, to to an intermediate state, but at some time in the future the virtuous souls will occupy other bodies. About the body there is a constant reiteration of statement that it is not a part of the soul, is corruptible, and generally a hindrance to the free movements of the soul, Ap. 2.24:(203); War 7.8:7(346).

In the teaching of the Pharisees there is no clear inference of the soul's preexistence. They teach its immortality, but that looks to the future and not to the past. Whether the Pharisees taught transmigration of souls in some form is a question. That the language of Josephus may infer it, is evident. He avoids a clear statement on a Jewish future resurrection. Prideaux holds that the doctrine of transmigration of souls was taught among the Jews.[10] He cites Mt. 16:13-14; (cf. 17:1-8; 27:52-53; Lk. 9:7-9; 9:19). But these were resurrections and appearances due largely to the entense apocalyptic expectation of the people. There is little, if anything, in the passages to indicate the doctrine of transmigration, as such. We conclude that Josephus attempts a synthesis of the Greek idea of soul continuation and the Jewish resurrection doctrine, and in doing so, he employs language which suggests the doctrine of transmigration.

---

10. H. Prideaux, The Historical Connection of the Old and New Testaments, Vol. 2, p.289; cf. J. J. I. Dollinger, The Gentile and the Jew, Vol. 2, p.310.

Sin

A discussion of ethics divides itself into two parts, virtue and sin. We do not find this division in Apion, but for convenience we may adopt it in dealing with Josephus' references to the ethics of first century Judaism.

Israel's ideal ethical state is a theocracy, a state in which God is sovereign and the people are His subjects. It is an ideal state, law expressing the will of God is supreme, Ap. 2.21(184). Men valued it more than their own lives, and very few ever transgressed it, Ap. 2.18(178); 1.8(42), since all knew it to its smallest detail, and its transgression was punished more severely than punishment among other peoples for transgression of their laws, Ap. 2.38(276f). For the Jews virtue, piety, consisted in an exact knowledge of their laws. Their worship of God, therefore, was through knowledge and observance of their laws.

This ideal state was not dependent upon any political form of government. It could be realized under different forms. And thus submission to civil rulers and laws, provided they did not contravene the Jewish customs and worship, was possible and in fact enjoined, Ap. 2.6(76). The Jews could be loyal or at least submissive to rulers who did not meddle with their religious customs and worship.

Among the Jews the "fear of God", εὐσέβεια, was the chief virtue. It and justice toward men were the sum of all virtues, Ant. 9.11;2(236). Religion, εὐσέβεια, was not a part of virtue, but all virtues were a part of religion, Man's first duty was to God, and for Josephus was true piety, Ap. 2.16(171). Jewish piety is displayed in the exercise of δικαιοσύνη, καρτερία, σωφροσύνη and ὁμόνοια. Harmony and concord, ὁμόνοια, substituted for φρονήσις is

Jewish, but we trace its emphasis to Josephus' apologetic attitude; for the wisdom of the Jews was not the intellectualism of the Greeks as implied in wisdom, φρόνησις. The above may then be regarded as the four cardinal virtues among the Jews according to Josephus, and εὐσέβεια as including all with the additional element in it of worship of God, for the statement in Apion is clearly a summary, Ap. 2. 14(150); 2.16(171).

The Jews' understanding of their duty to others is summed up in the words: "and for our duty at the sacrifices themselves, we ought, in the first place, to pray for the common welfare of them,- all men,- and after that, our own: for we are made for fellowship one with another, and he who prefers the common good before what is peculiar to himself, is above all acceptable to God, Ap. 2.23(196). For the Jews true friendship consisted in mutual trust, Ap. 2.27(207). Their law of conduct toward Centiles was to admit those who desired to observe the Jewish law, since, after all true union is not only in "identity of race", but in "similarity of conduct", Ap. 2.28(110). Hospitality toward strangers, and mercy upon enemies were to be exercised; even gentleness and humaneness toward animals, Ap. 2.29(213).

There is no distinct reference to the tendency of the heart to sin, (Yetzer hara) in Josephus. Evil motives, and inner evil conditions are mentioned; but not the doctrine of the "evil heart" as such. Sin for Josephus is largely the habitual and overt act. Sin is transgression, wilfull and due to ignorance, of moral and ceremo-

---

11. Müller p.300, cites other references to harmony or concord. They are: Ap. 1.5; 1.7; 1.33; 2.15; 2.19; 2.20; 2.38; 2.41; them too the references to lack of harmony among the Greeks, which are: Ap. 1.3;1.4; 1.5; 2.16; 2.18; 2.19; 2.36.

nial laws, Ap. 2.17(174). Injustice was a term that might include a number of sins, Ap. 2.5(57). Idolatry was the great sin against the being of God, Ap. 2.6(75). Calumny is a sin worse than sacrilege, Ap. 2.8(89). It is full of "nothing but cruelty and impudence," Ap. 2.8(97). For their calumnies of Josephus, Catullus and Apion were punished by dreadful diseases and died, War 7.11:4(453); Ap. 2.13(143). And adultery with kindred vices were regarded as major sins. Failure to submit to the priest was regarded as "impiety toward God", Ap. 2. 23(194). Drunkenness was sin, and priests did not drink wine when engaged in sacrificing, War 5.5:7(229).

A judge who accepted bribes was punished by death, Ap. 2.27 (207).[12] The refusal to extend help and mercy to the needy incurred guilt, Ap. 2.27(207). Claiming anything found, as one's own was sin, as well as theft. Usury was against the law, Ap. 2.27(208). In business short measures or short weights, and driving a sharp bargain were illegal, Ap. 2.27(208). Rapine and defrauding one's own countrymen were crimes, War 2.20:7(581). Sedition and revolt from divinely appointed civil authority were violations of God's law, to which numerous passages testify.

Possible violations against ceremonial laws are too many to be discussed in detail. They are as numerous as the laws and customs themselves. Punishment upon Gentiles for their transgression was sometimes very severe, Ant. 15.11:5(417); cf. 12.3:4. Violations of customs by Jews led to punishment by God as well as violations of the moral law.

---

12. Müller comments that this law is found neither in the Pentateuch nor in the Talmud.

Since Apion is an apology, it presents the ethics of Judaism ideally. The basis of the presentation is the Pentateuch and the oral tradition. But the cumulative evidence of Josephus' other works with that of first-century literature both Jewish and Greco-Roman writings, especially against the Jews, indicate that because of the stress of events, in their relation to one another and to God there was frequent deviation from the path of piety; and in their relation to strangers and enemies, the charges of exclusivism and even cruelty by their opponents were not altogether unfounded.[13] Their ideal is well expressed in the words in praise of the Jewish law: "For I suppose it will thence become evident, that the laws we have given us are disposed after the best manner for the advancement of piety, for mutual communion with one another, for a general love of mankind, as also for justice, and for sustaining labors with fortitude and for a contempt of death"; but the Greco-Roman world of the first century as portrayed by Josephus and others was in general effeminate yet cruel, and it is historically probable that the Jewish nation remained unaffected by Greek influence, cf. Ant. 16.6;8.

Salvation (Including Messianism).

The doctrine of punishment is the counterpart of the doctrine of salvation in its narrower sense, that of rewards. The entire idea of salvation in Josephus is colored by legalism. Since the law provides for every part of life, it follows that whatever is allotted to men of reward or punishment is due to their observance or transgression of the law. We are told that all things ought to have piety

---

13. Bousset, Die Religion des Judentums 157-8 says: "Bei dem Durchschnitt und der Masse dieses Judentums ist sicher der inhumane Charakter der Jüdischen Moral der vorherrschende geblieben und diese exklusivität hat sich seit dem augusteischen Zeitalter nur mehr und

for their end. This piety according to Josephus is something unique with the Jew, and only a result of the strictest attention to the Torah, or law, Ap. 2.16(171). Then too, virtue is not only a result of obedience, but in itself it has its own reward, that is, a good conscience, Ant. 4.8:2(182). But with virtue come other blessings. Individual and national prosperity are assured to the Jews, if they obey God's will, and the divinely appointed rulers of the nation, War 4.8:2(187). Israel will then be able to resist opposing nations, and in her posterity will enjoy immortal fame, War 4.8:2(133). In her pursuit of virtue, she will enjoy the care of God, who is her Protector. But by holding virtue in contempt through self-will, the favor of God is forfeited, War 4.8:2(190). He who submits to God and constituted human authority has his own conscience to witness to his piety, Ap. 2.30(218).

On the other hand, the smallest transgression of the law is punished without mercy. And although only a few ever transgress the law, those few are the very ones that cannot escape the punishment of the law, Ap. 2.29(214); 41(291); 18(176). The Jewish laws prove their superiority by their severity, Ap. 2.20;38. Jews are consequently more afraid of transgressing their laws than they are of death, Ap. 2.38(277). Death is the punishment for many sins, e.g. adultery, Ap. 2.24(201); rape, Ap. 2.30(215); sodomy, Ap. 2.24(199); accepting bribe, Ap. 2.27(207). disobedience to parents, Ap. 2.27(206); and impiety toward God, Ap. 2.30(217). These punishments are not such as are found among other nations, but are more severe, Ap. 2.30(216).

In dealing with future rewards and punishments Josephus is obscure. He is consistent throughout in stating the view of a resurrection for the righteous only. The Pharisees held that virtuous

souls "shall have power to revive and live again", but the wicked a are doomed to eternal punishment, War 2.8:14(163); Ant. 18.1:3. The pious or righteous in this life look for a time after death when their souls shall rehabilitate bodies, Ap. 2.30(218).

There is no great final assize in Josephus. Punishments and rewards are pronounced in Hades, "under the earth," War 2.8:14(165). Josephus is utterly silent on the catastrophic appearances at the coming of the great judge to set up His throne of judgment, as in some apocalyptic writers. But Hades has taken on moral aspects in his writings. In one passage heaven is the intermediate state for the righteous, War 3.8:5(374). Since Josephus presents Vespasian as the fulfiller of Messianic prophecy, he does not speak of accoming Messiah as the final judge of men.

The resurrection life was promised by the prophet Moses, and God Himself gave the righteous Jews who"lived exactly according to the laws, a firm conviction that even though on earth they had to die for the laws, at a certain revolution of things shall receive a better life than they had enjoyed before, Ap. 2.30(218). The thought of rest from and compensation of suffering for righteousness' sake seems to be implied. This thought is supported by the statement that it was a glorious thing to die for the laws of their country, War 1. 33:2(650); because that the soul was immortal, and that an eternal enjoyment of happiness did await such as died on that account. The souls of the righteous being pure, in the "revolution of the ages, are again sent into pure bodies", War 3.8:5(374).

The phrases "revolution of the ages" and revolution of things" with the words, "Nor would I venture to write thus at this time", etc. are perhaps covert allusions to Jewish apocalyptic hope generally

unacceptable to his patron and readers, especially the Messianic phases of it. Here again he touches upon aspects of first century Judaism which were not understood, or if understood, little appreciated by the Greco-Roman world. Many viewed the golden period of the early Empire as the supreme era of universal peace and prosperity. Also the New Testament reflects the difficulty which Gentile converts had in adjusting themselves to the exchatology of the early Christian missionaries, who had their eschatology from Judaism. By a deft turn of phrases Josephus neutralizes the doctrines he seeks to discuss. Nor was his apologetics concerned with the idealistic future of his people. He sought to make the nation's position secure under the imperial government whose genius was order and organization. The Jewish law, therefore, with its strong emphasis upon harmonious living was an effective weapon of defense.

Josephus' view of Messianism may be briefly stated. The passages are well known. Upon his capture in Galilee in the summer of 68 A. D., he comes as a messenger of great tidings from God to Vespasian and predicts: "Thou, O Vespasian, art Caesar, and not only I lord over me, but over the land and the sea, and all mankind", War 3. 8:9(401). He says certain Jews undertook the war because of an "ambiguous oracle in their sacred writings, how about that time, one from their country should become governor of the habitable earth". This oracle, he says, "certainly denoted the government of Vespasian, who was appointed emperor in Judea, War 6.5:4(313). His extreme opposition to Zealotism, and his disapproval of the apocalyptic manifestations during the first century are indications that he shared neither the Davidic, nor the apocalyptic Messianic hope.[14]

14. A. Poznanski, Ueber die religions philosophischen Anschauungen, u.s.w. p.31, regards the words of Josephus as merely referring to Vespasian's eminent qualifications to rule.

To this must be added what he says about an "Aristocracy".

In Ant. 4.8:17(223) Josephus reports Moses as saying that, "Aristocracy, and the way of living under it, is the best constitution". Samuel was troubled because the people desired a king, and because "he was very fond of an aristocracy, himself", Ant. 6.3:3(36). "The people were glad to be freed from monarchical government, and were governed for the future by an aristocracy", War 1.8:5(170). If we compare these passages, especially Ant. 4.8:17(223), with Josephus' definition of a theocracy in Apion 2.16(165), we are led to infer that his highest ambition ofe his people was a social order to be ruled by a council of their chief men - Sanhedrin - under the law, with God as their only sovereign. His lamentation over Jerusalem: "Yet mayst thou again grow better, if perchance thou wilt hereafter appease the anger of that God who is the author of thy destruction", War 5.1:3(19), has little, if any, of the glorious hope the Jewish people inherited and proclaimed for their beloved Zion.

Josephus' account of the Sadducees in War 2.8:14 and Ant. 18. 1:4 shows that theydidid not hold the more definite and more elaborate eschatological doctrines of Judaism which included Messianism. Just before the final downfall of the city Josephus reports: "men of learning discouraged the hopes of the people for miraculous deliverance". The prophet Jesus, son of Ananus, a plebeian, was seized by some of the most eminent among the people and scourged. Thereupon the rulers brought him to the Roman procurator. Yet some of the wise men were deceived by the prophecy that Josephus interpreted as denoting Vespasian's rule, War 6.5:4(313). The Sadducees retained the national blessedness of the Old Testament, but they disregarded the apocalyptics taking its rise in Ezekiel and developed in later Jewish liter-

ature, and that was prevalent in the first century A. D.

He does mention the militant Messianic stirrings of the Zealot type in his time, but unsympathetically. "Impostors", "sicarii", "robbers", "false prophets", "zealots" for Josephus are all in one class, that is, seditious revolters. The above passage, War.6.5:4(313), shows that he is aware of their reason for seditious revolt. Zealotism was the attempt to restore and maintain Israel's independence, religious and political, apart from other surrounding nations, and to realize what to them was God's purposed kingdom for Israel upon earth over which God should rule. This kingdom for them was promised in the predictions of Old Testament prophets. For their attempt to establish it, they had historical precedent in the Maccabean revolt. From that time until 70 A. D. the zealot spirit had increased, especially with the steady advance of Roman rule. It was not entirely quenched by the downfall of Jerusalem, War 7.8f. The platform of zealotism was: "God is our only Ruler and Lord". The realization of this platform was its objective. We trace its beginnings to the time of Antipater, Ant. 14.9:3,4. There was an outburst of it in Herod's palace, if we may trust the context, Ant. 17.8:4. Zealotism began definitely about 6 A. D. due to the Roman census-taking and taxation at the time when the Herodian rulers were replaced by imperial procurators, Ant. 18.1:1. From that time it developed rapidly for sixty years until under Florus in the year 66 A. D. when it burst forth in fury.

Jewish ideas of how God would bring deliverance to His people were not uniform, or always definite. The Zealots thought it obligatory upon them to do their part by national revolt, and that working

with Him they would gain their desired liberty. Others, but included by Josephus among the "innovators", assumed a more passive attitude. There were those who persuaded the people to follow them into the wilderness, saying that "there God would show them the signals of liberty, War 2.13:3(259); 6.5:3(351); 7.11:1(438); Ant.20.5:1. No violence was employed against the Romans, but apparitions were promised to those who would follow. In the "signs" mentioned we are evidently on Messianic ground, War 6.5:3(288f). In the days of famine and distress, the people under the guidance of false prophets still expected miraculous deliverance. Josephus records a list of signs which the people misinterpreted as foreboding deliverance. The eastern gate of the inner court of the Temple opened "of its own accord", and to the unlearned, says he, "it seemed as if God did thereby open them the gate of happiness," cf Zech. 9:9; Isa. 62:11; Mt. 21:1-11; 11:1-11.

Josephus throws light upon the eschatology of the New Testament, especially of the Gospels. In reading one is reminded of the eschatological discourse of Jesus, War 6.5:3; cf. Mk. 13; Mt. 24. The frequent use of the terms "robbers" and "thieves" may be compared with Jn. 10:1,8 and Lk. 23:39-43, especially verse 40. The two thieves with Jesus were probably insurrectionists, for they are "in the same condemnation". The wilderness is also a prominent feature in both Josephus and the Gospels in connection with Messianic expectation. Again crucifixion was a common punishment for "robbers" and "impostors", Ant. 20.6:2(129); 20.5:2(102); 17.10.

7. Other Types of Jewish Faith.

Sadduceeism and Essenism do not represent the religious belief and practice of any large part of Judaism. However, they represent tendencies or interests, which, if never prominent, were at least persistent in Judaism since the time of Hyrcanus I, according to Josephus. Our author does not regard either as a heretical sect cast out from orthodox Judaism. They were types of Jewish faith sharing much with Pharisaism, yet distinct from it. Because of this they may be mentioned as types of Judaism's faith, although they were never dominant.

1. Sadducees:- The Sadducees in Josephus' works, when reference is made to their distinctive beliefs, are contrasted with the Pharisees. As a class they did not have the sympathy and support o of the people. Nevertheless, they were a sect, αἵρεσις, peculiar to the Jews. They were more a smaller class than the Pharisees, since they were mainly of priestly lineage and of the political and social aristocracy, Ant. 18:1:3(4); 13.10:6; War 2.8:14.

In their attitude toward oral tradition they were conservative accepting only the written word as over against the Pharisees, who already in the time of Hyrcanus I had special interpretation of the law, Ant. 13.10:6(297f). It was because the Sadducees rejected the halacha and haggada that the people were not obedient to them. But this reason given by Josephus is only incidental. The people followed the Pharisees because the Pharisees represented standard Judaism in faith, worship, teaching, and ideal. They made Judaism as a religion and ethics by the use of the Old Testament, and mainly through the synagogue. They (Sadducees) prized most highly the Pentateuch, and it was because the oral tradition was not a part of it that they

regarded it as not obligatory, Ant. 13.10:6(297). Because of their refusal to accept the oral tradition the Pharisees disputed with them. The Sadducees regarded it an act of piety to contend for the sufficiency of the law of Moses as obligatory, Ant. 18.1:4(16). But when the Sadducees assumed public office, they unwillingly but perforce subscribed to the legalism of the Pharisees, in order to get along with the people, Ant. 13.10:6(298); 20.9:1(199). As officers they were severe toward offenders, whereas the Pharisees usually were not. They had little regard for the public, and were not friendly even toward each other, War. 2.8:14(166).

The Sadducees held a deistic view of providence. They dispensed with fate, as having no place in human affairs. They regarded man as entirely responsible for his actions, both good and bad. Sin, for them, was its own punishment. God was not concerned with human conduct. The shaping of one's life lay entirely with the individual. God had given the Jews the Pentateuch by which to regulate their individual and corporate life. He was too transcendent to meddle constantly in human affairs, Ant. 1811:4; War 2.8:14, et al.

Their doctrine concerning the future was that death ended all. Souls were mortal, that is just as the body died, so, and at the same time, the soul perished. Consequently, there were no rewards or punishments in Hades. Our author's statement needs explanation. He is thinking of Epicureans who held a theory of annihilation at death, and not of Jewish Sadducees. He has Hellenized Sadducean doctrine, which was the Old Testament teaching concerning Sheol. Sheol was a somewhat undefined and unattractive existence after death, but not annihilation. The Sheol doctrine did not include a resur-

rection or supernatural Messiah. Annihilation was no part of any type of Jewish faith.

Josephus places his material regarding the sects in contexts dealing with seditions and revolts, but not in the writing against Apion. It is highly probable that for him, such contexts suggested the distinctive characteristics both in faith and practice of the sects, and that below their distinctions lay the larger Jewish idea of the kingdom of God, for the realization of which, the Jews revolted. The topics upon which the sects held distinctive views find mention also in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Perhaps we may best regard Sadduceeism as a protest not only against excessive legalism, but also against the apocalypticism of the Pharisees. Their question to Jesus would seem to indicate their objection to the speculations about the future so rife in their day.[15]

2/ Essenes:- The Essenes were one of the four sects of first century Judaism. Their organization may be termed an ascetic communism based upon Jewish legalism, War.2.8. Every part of their daily routine was carefully regulated, and scrupulously observed. The separate colonies in the cities were ruled by "curators", War 2. 8:5(129). Besides these "curators" they had pious priests as stewards, Ant. 18.1:5(22), who managed the common affairs of the groups. New members were admitted into the groups only after a severe novitiate of three years, and after taking "tremendous oaths", War 2.8: 7(137f). They had an elaborate system of ceremonial rites, both in the initiatory services, and in their daily manner of living. Among

---

15. J. G. Müller says; Fl. Jos. gegen Apion, pp.298-9 commenting on Ap. 2.16: "Dem Joseph ergeht es oft wie dem Philo, dass er nach Act der Apologeten ob mancherrubereinstimmender Anknupfungspunkte die spezifische Verschiedenheit nicht bemerkt. Er giebt zu viel zu. Die Anschauung von Gott wenn auch monotheistisch, ist doch bei den Griechen naturbefangen pantheistisch, ist doch vergeistigte Natur, und zugleich neben der ewigen Materie dualistisch". See also Ant. 3.15:3(322).

these rites were at least three different kinds of washings, War 2. 8:7(138); 9(149); 10(150); cf. 12(159). Their piety was extraordinary. Blaspheming Moses was capitally punished, War 2.8:9(145); 10(152). During the war they preferred torture and death to committing this sin, War 2.8:9. The rivtues which were especially displayed among the Essenes were mutual kindness, continence, disregard of riches, industry, temperance, mercy, peacefulness and long-suffering, Ant. 18.1:5; War 2.8. In their initiatory oaths the candidate promised to exercise justice, endurance in hardships, truthfulness and simplicity of life and manners, honesty toward others, and to be law-abiding, War 2.8:2(121); Ant. 18.1:5(21). They held an extreme view of the Jewish estimate of woman's status in society, War 2.8:2(121); Ant. 18.1:5(21). In administering punishment they were severe, but passed sentence only with the greatest accuracy and justice by the votes of a court "not fewer than a hundred", War 2.8:8-9)145).

The Essenes thought it best to ascribe all things to God, Ant. 18.1:5(18). Yet this was not a despairing fatalism which led to carelessness of conduct, for they also taught that man should strive for the "rewards of righteousness", Ant. 18.1:5(18). Men felt responsible in this life, and were incited to practice virtue and refrain from vice, because they held hopes and fears for the future life and believed that the soul was immortal, War 2.8:11(154-7).

The Essenes' doctrine of man was dualistic. The body was only a prison to the soul, which was in some form pre-existent, and immortal. The body was corruptible, and passed away. Although the soul was drawn to the body by a "certain natural enticement", yet it gladly left the body and "mounted upward", War 2.8:11(1547).

There were eternal rewards and punishments after death. The righteous received the rewards of their righteousness. The evil suffered eternal punishment, War 2,8:11(154-7). The doctrines among the Essenes were kept secret or at least, the greatest care was exercised in imparting them to others. The proselyte was sworn "to preserve the books belonging to the sect, and the names of the angels", War 2.8:7. By reading their sacred books together with the Old Testament prophets, and by using several sorts of purifications, some of the Essenes received the power of prediction, War 2.8:12.

The large block of data in War 2.8 is indicative of Josephus' admiration for Essenism. But the events of his life such as his three marriages (probably four), Life 75(414); 76(426-7),[16] his views of Providence, his noncommunistic attitude, Life 76(425), his ancestry, Life 1, and his own statement that he joined the Pharisees, Life 2(12), show that although their idealism affected him, it did not control him.

The dualism of the Essenes was more Gnostic than Platonic, in the antithetic relation of body and soul. The four classes of Essenes, the higher subject to defilement by the lower, suggest the different and several grades of purity to be attained in Gnosticism. Essenism was an extreme attempt to actualize the Levitical ceremonial laws with little, if any conscious borrowing from Hellenistic sources such as Pythagoreanism.[17]

---

16. A statement in War 5.9(419) make four marriages probable. In Life Josephus accompanied Titus from Alexandria to the Roman camp before Jerusalem. In War 5.9 he makes a speech alluding to his wife together with his mother - the latter, we know was in the besieged city - as being in great danger. It looks as though his first wife was also one of the besieged.

17. Josephus does not support Tideman's statement: "De woonplaats der Esseners, wier getal op vierduizend personen begroot wordt, lag buiten de steden van Palestina in afzonderlyke kolonien." See B. Tideman, Het Essenisme, p.14.

S E L E C T E D B I B L I O G R A P H Y

C. D. Monge, Philo Judaeus	London	1855.
J. J. I. Dollinger, The Gentile and the Jew	London	1862.
I. Traill, The Jewish War of Flavius Josephus with Introduction	London	1862.
Ernst Gerlach, Die Weissagungen des Alten Testaments in den Schriften des F. Jos.	Berlin	1863.
H. Prideaux, The Historical Connection of the Old and New Testaments	London	1865.
J. Langen, Judenthum in Palaestina	Freiburg	1866.
B. Tideman, Het Essenisme	Leiden	1868.
J. Wellhausen, Die Pharisäer und die Sadducaer	Greifswald	1874.
J. G. Müller, Flavius Josephus gegen Apion	Basel	1877.
H. Bloch, Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus	Leipzig	1879.
J. von Destinon, Die Chronologie des Josephus	Leipzig	1880
E. Stapfer, Palestine in the Time of Christ-3rd ed.	New York	1885.
P. Grünbaum, Die Priestergesetze bei Flavius Jos.	Halle -	1887.
A. Lewinsky, Beitrage zur Kenntnis der Religions philosophischen Anschauungen des Flavius Josephus	Breslau	1887.
B. Niese, Flavii Josephi Opera, 6 vols.	Berlin	1887-1894.
A. Poznanski, Ueber die Religions Philosophischen Anschauungen des Flavius Josephus	Halle	1887.
S. A. Naber, Flavii Josephi Opera Omnia, 4 vols.	Lipsiae	1888-1893.
A. R. Shilleto, The Works of Flavius Josephus	London	1889-1890.
A. von Gutschmid, Kleine Schriften, vols. IV	Leipzig	1893.
G. Widdeboer, The Origin of the Canon of the Old Testament	London	1895.
C. H. Cornill, Einleitung in das Alte Testament 3rd ed.	Freiburg	1896.

D. W. Amram, The Jewish Law of Divorce, etc.	Philadelphia	1896.
J. Taylor, Sayings of the Fathers, 2nd ed.	Cambridge	1897.
F. Weber, Jüdische Theologie, 2 aufl.	Leipzig	1903.
D. Blau, Das Altjüdische Zauberwesen	Strassburg	1898.
P. Volz, Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba	Leipzig	1903.
J. Elbogen, Die Religions Anschauungen der Pharisäer	Berlin	1904.
G. Holscher, Die Quellen des Josephus fur die Zeit vom Exil bis zum judischen Kriege	Leipzig	1904.
M. Friedlander, Die Religiosen Bewegungen Innerhalb des Judentums, u.s.w.	Berlin-	1905.
D. W. Bousset, Die Religion dps Jüdentums, 2 Aufl.	Berlin	1906.
O. Holtzmann, Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte 2 Aufl.	Tubingen	1906.
P. Krüger, Philo und Josephus als Apologeten, u.s.2.	Leipzig	1906.
D. S. Margoliouth, Works of Flavius Josephus with Introduction	London	1906.
G. Hölscher, Der Sadduzaismus	Leipzig	1906.
J. Bergmann, Jüdische Apologetik	Berlin	1908.
P. Krüger, Hellenismus und Jüdentum, u.s.w.	Leipzig	1908.
E. W. G. Masterman, Studies in Galilee	Chicago	1909.
E. Schürer, Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes, 4 Aufl.	Leipzig	1909.
L. Blau, Die Jüdische Ehescheidung u.s.w.	Strassburg	1911.
N. Bentwich, Josephus	Philadelphia	1914.
Foakes, Jackson and Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity Part I, vol. I,	London	1920.
R. Laquer, Der Jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus,	Giessen	1920.
W. Weber, Josephus und Vespasian	Leipzig	1921.

Articles in Encyclopedias and Publications.

S. Krauss, Art. Josephus, Jewish Encyclopedia, vol 7, p. 274f.

B. Niese, Art. Josephus, Hastings Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, vol 7, p. 569f.

E. Schürer, Art. Josephus, Real-Encyclopädie, vol 7, p. 109f.

H. St. J. Thackeray, Josephus, Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, Extra Volume, p. 461f.